The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME VII | New York, Saturday, July 22, 1916 | Number 90

Contents

Editorial Notes 287

Leading Editorials

The Problem of the Progressive Voter 290
What Progressives May Ask of Mr. Hughes 291
The Deadlock in the Cloak Trade 292

General Articles

Why We Have a Pork Barrel...Frederick A. Cleveland 294
Beclouding the Minimum Wage.....Alvin S. Johnson 296
The Feminist's Age.....Hester A. Hopkins 299
Albert the Male.....W. L. 301
The Apotheosis of the State.....Harold J. Laski 302
The Way of Germany and the Way of Mexico
Hendrik Willem van Loon 304

Correspondence 305

Books and Things.....P. L. 308

Reviews of Books

The Commonwealth of Greater Britain.....H. C. 309

CONVENTIONAL leaders of the bar bewail the increasing embroilment in politics of the Supreme Court. That the Supreme Court is more and more concerned with issues of a political character is true. There are now pending before the Supreme Court more cases to be dealt with as questions of politics than ever before. For how can a minimum wage law, the steel trust case, or the migratory bird law avoid involving fundamental questions of statesmanship? That is why the personnel of the court is watched with such concern. Partisanship on any of the pending contentious questions is not wanted. But two qualifications are fundamental, assuming of course thorough technical ability. First, a statesman's insight that the Federal constitution is one of the means towards national life and not a limit upon it; secondly, a catholic and seasoned experience with the varied activities of the modern state. The successor to Mr. Justice Hughes named by President Wilson is endowed with these essentials. A mind naturally broad in its sympathies he has sharpened by a comprehensive legal practice and rendered publicly useful by an alert and disinterested activity in the progressive movements of recent Ohio politics. As a railroad lawyer he has become familiar with what is one of the outstanding problems before the country as well as before the court, and he has gained that experience without any subtle undermining of a passionate intellectual rectitude. As a Federal Judge he has already had occasion to demonstrate that no industrial issue can adequately be judged except in terms of the lives and concrete happiness of the families dependent upon it. Therefore we do not doubt that Mr. Justice Clark will line up with that view of constitutional policy represented by Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Day and Mr. Justice Brandeis.

MR. EUGENE PHILBIN, a Supreme Court Justice of New York, has written an article for *Truth*, which is a violent attack on Mayor Mitchel for his stand in the charities case. Since he is a judge, Mr. Philbin might have tried a little harder to tell the truth. His first assumption is that Mayor Mitchel set out to "attack" the Catholic Church.

> The first attack was made by him and others some years ago and resulted in an absolute vindication of the institutions.

It did not. It resulted in much undignified resentment, pamphlets, sermons, and slashing of votes followed by a complete victory for the city. The institutions taking public money were compelled for the first time to render a satisfactory fiscal accounting.

Then further:

> The city has the right to refuse to make payments to the institutions if the rules prescribed by the State Board of Charities are not followed. The Mayor should at least be able to point out in what respect the institutions have refused to conduct their affairs in an orderly manner or in accordance with such rules.

The Mayor has been able to point this out with such force that a number of the more sensible institutions followed his specifications and reformed. It

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is sheer nonsense to regard the whole episode as an attack on the Catholic Church. All institutions, Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, German, Negro, were examined, and of those severely criticised less than half were Catholic. And of the Catholic institutions criticised many have since made needed reforms. There has been no deliberate attack on the Catholics. It is merely that a number of prominent Catholics have chosen to regard themselves as attacked when they were merely asked to make child care conform to modern standards.

THE charge that Mayor Mitchel has done his duty to make himself popular is preposterous. Everyone knows that a quarrel with the Church is the very last thing any politician desires or undertakes. It is recognized as a form of political suicide. Popularity indeed—Justice Philbin knows better. He knows that the enmity of the Church is practically fatal to a man who seeks office by election. There is nothing in his sneer. Mayor Mitchel has staked his political future by his courage, and the only reward he can hope for is his own sense of duty well done and the gratitude of that minority which loves a man who is careless of his own career. We wish Justice Philbin were correct in saying that Mayor Mitchel has made himself popular. We should like nothing better than to believe that democracy recognizes the rare value of men like Mayor Mitchel. We should gladly believe if we could that the most fearless political act of this generation would be rewarded by the masses of people in whose service it was done.

DEBATE in the Senate on the Navy bill is throwing up some extraordinary ebullitions of statesmanship. Senator Swanson, for instance, declared that the United States must become and remain incontestably the world's second naval power. Good, but what political objects shall this second largest fleet be used to serve? The Senator enumerates many, to one of which he attaches the greatest importance. "The unjust restrictions," he says, "that Great Britain has imposed upon our commerce during the progress of this war emphasizes to us the necessity of having a navy large enough to demand and enforce our rights." The United States is, consequently, to build the second largest navy in the world as preparation for a quarrel with the nation which controls the largest navy in the world. This is a perfect example of the utter discrepancy between means and end so characteristic of American political thinking. The building of the second largest navy means, if it means anything, that the United States cannot be safe unless it reaches a political understanding with the mistress of the seas. A controversy with the British Empire is precisely the one political object for the carrying on of which the proposed navy would be useless.

CONGRESS should not be permitted to adjourn until it enacts one measure of tardy justice. The passage of the Kern-McGillicuddy Bill providing uniform and adequate compensation for injured employees of the government is dictated by every consideration of party good faith and policy. The Democrats made an explicit promise in their platform of 1912 that a new and better Federal employees' compensation law would, if possible, be placed on the statute books by them. The bill now before the Senate has been carefully drawn. It is based on the best existing state laws and includes no provision not already in successful operation. It has already passed the House of Representatives by the practically unanimous vote of 286 to 3. It is meeting in the Senate with no opposition on its merits. The only obstacle to its passage is the desire of the Senate to adjourn soon, but if the Democratic leaders do not insist upon its enactment before adjourning they will be blundering badly. The failure of the bill could not be considered as anything but an exhibition of callous indifference to the needs of those workmen and women for whose welfare Congress is undeniably and exclusively responsible.

WITH the President's signature attached to the Rural Credits bill, an important step has been taken in the direction of emancipating the farmer from excessive interest rates and other injurious incidents of an unorganized agricultural loan market. It would be unfortunate, however, if the Administration, in its justifiable gratification over the enactment of the law, were to overvalue the work that has already been accomplished. The law is merely a good beginning. Whether it ends in anything really worth while depends on the kind of administrative machinery the government sets up. Rural credit is a field in which good intentions, unsupported by clearly wrought out policies and expert service, may accomplish very little and may even work harm instead of good. There is no lack of experience in other countries to show how rural credit laws that read well may still have the effect of increasing speculation, of kiting land values and of leaving the gulf between tiller and owner wider than before.

THERE has been much criticism of the rural credits law, because it ignores the existing banking organization and creates an entirely new machinery. There is a possibility of economy in operating the commercial banks and the mortgage-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

loan institutions under the same roof and by the same personnel. Yet where rural credit institutions have been most successful, their relations with the commercial banks have always been indirect. The principles of rural-mortgage credit and commercial credit have only a superficial resemblance. The habit of mind that is most efficient in determining whether an application for a three months' loan may safely be granted is not the habit of mind most competent to deal with the conditions under which loans running ten, twenty, or thirty years may safely be made. Public policy may as a rule be left out of account in the handling of short term loans; in the handling of long term loans the claims of public policy can not be disregarded. Accordingly it is doubtless wiser to forego the immediate economies of combining the operations of commercial banks and rural credit institutions, in order that we may have greater freedom in working out the social and administrative principles appropriate to institutions of the latter type.

COLONEL JOHN M. PARKER'S feelings about the Progressive party cannot fail to arouse sympathy, for the party did offer some hope of breaking the Solid South. But his plan to call a convention and revive the party now is doomed to failure. The reason is that the Progressives have no principles and no interest around which to form a national party. The January statement, the Chicago platform, and the blind support of Mr. Roosevelt robbed the party of all distinction, and left it with nothing but a vague desire for a separate existence. The bitter truth is that Col. Parker and his friends have at this moment no creed and no national following. They have nothing but their own good will upon which to build. That a third party ought to exist is clear. But national parties are not created out of enthusiasm. They are formed out of the needs of social groups, and their platforms are a formulation of group interests. No successful third party will be created, we believe, by middle-class reformers—though they might lead one. If a third party is formed again it will be by a coalition of labor and agriculture become class conscious. So long as those two great interests are content to play politics in the old parties, radicals will be homeless.

IT is impossible to take very seriously the rumors from Mexico of a new coalition government to include Cientifico, revolutionary and socialistic elements. Coalitions are appropriate to a stage in political development in which partisan differences are of a vanishing character, or sunk into insignificance because the nation is confronted by a foreign danger of the first magnitude. If the differences between the United States and Mexico had actually terminated in war or were likely so to terminate, a government including Calero, Angeles, Limantour, Maytorena and Magon might be thinkable. As conditions stand the project is fantastic. The revolutionary trend is still dominant in Mexico. No government that can not vindicate its revolutionary legitimacy has the least chance of success, unless, of course, it receives the active support of the United States government—something improbable in the present temper of Washington. The Carranza government may not be able to hold out, but if it falls, its successor will hardly be much more to the liking of the Cientificos.

PRISON reform makes an important advance with the establishment of a mental clinic at Sing Sing. Not only should this increase our knowledge of the causes and pathology of crime and improve vastly the intelligence of treatment, but it will also put the Mutual Welfare League on a sounder basis. The friends of Mr. Osborne have feared since the beginning that his experiment might be wrecked and discredited by prisoners who were congenitally asocial. One or two radical defectives might do infinite harm, for democracy in prison as well as outside it cannot be absolutely inclusive. There are some who will not or cannot play any game in coöperation with their fellows and the Sing Sing community needs protection against them. By introducing standards of discrimination Mr. Osborne strengthens his work incalculably. He introduces the fundamental idea that all principles are matters of more and less. He puts aside any thought of a dogma that all can be treated alike, and establishes the notion, so fundamental in all reform, that goodwill can be permanently successful only where science is its instrument.

IF twenty-five out of every thousand employees in American industries are constantly incapacitated by illness, this means that the average worker loses eight days each year on this account alone. Not only is this time a dead loss to the worker in money wages and savings, but owing to the lack of medical attention and of proper care, the worker is likely to lay the foundation for further illness or weak health. Health insurance would provide medical attendance for all workers and thus lessen the chances of future illness. Even the lowest-paid workers who are now most subject to ill-health would have adequate medical relief placed within their reach. A government system which distributed the cost between employers, employees and the public would put a premium on the removal of the bad industrial and living conditions that made for sickness. But perhaps the chief value of such a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system would be its emphasis on the truth that health is not merely a good to be desired, but the very minimum foundation of a decent society. A government which ignores health insurance is not making effective to its citizens their rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

The Problem of the Progressive Voter

ELSEWHERE in this issue THE NEW REPUBLIC is accused by several correspondents of being both illogical and unrealistic in adopting a non-partisan attitude during the present campaign. In their opinion the only effective way of protesting against the illiberalism of the older parties is to support the Socialist ticket and to swell the Socialist vote. The Socialist candidate cannot possibly be elected, but if Benson in 1916 polls a million more votes than Debs did in 1912, the Democrats and Republicans might be driven into much more drastic concessions to liberalism. The most effective way to advance the cause of progressivism, it is argued, is to vote the Socialist ticket. As history shows, progressive measures have been wrung from conservative governments by the fear of a radical and usually a hopelessly minor party.

There is much to be said for the adoption of such tactics by progressive voters. Many former Progressives who are not Socialists will be persuaded by reasons similar to those advanced by our correspondents to vote the Socialist ticket without necessarily joining the Socialist party; and in so doing they may be adopting the course which will best serve their preferred political purposes. But the argument in favor of such a course, persuasive as it is, is not entirely conclusive. People whose vote is determined by such reasoning, are using it exclusively as a weapon of party warfare. Inasmuch as the major parties afford them so poor an opportunity of expressing a positive political preference and of bestowing power upon bodies whose policy they can whole-heartedly support, they join the protestants and discharge an emphatic "No" at the dominant political system. At times this is the best course to adopt, but it is a course which should be adopted with reluctance. So far as possible men and women should use the ballot to accomplish positive political purposes, to give effect to immediately significant political preferences. If by means of a vote immediate vitality can be imparted to the voter's positive convictions, such an affirmative vote has certain intrinsic advantages over its merely negative alternative. The voter has helped to put into power the man or the party which may do part of what he wants to have done. Or he has helped to exclude from power the man or the party which refuses to do a part of what he wants to have done.

It is the intrusion of the issue of "preparedness" into the present campaign which gives an affirmative vote for either the Republican or Democratic candidate a possible intrinsic value. The agitation for "preparedness" was initiated for the most part by essentially conservative people in the interest of what they took to be conservative objects; but in launching the agitation the conservatives were the victims of self-deception. Its actual effect has been the promotion of a certain amount of radicalism. At a moment when public opinion was inert and indifferent, the popular conscience unusually callous, and a conservative reaction dominant throughout the country, the agitation for preparedness reawakened public opinion to the flagrant deficiencies of American national organization and the impoverishment of American national policy. The honest attempt to prepare the country for the fulfilment of any serious responsibility sufficiently exposed its hopeless unpreparedness in other and equally essential respects. Thus an intentionally conservative movement has developed into a most useful social ferment which in the end is likely to make American national consciousness more intense, more sensitive, and more alert. It gives to a radical a reason to vote for either the Republican or the Democratic candidate and against the Socialist candidate, because the Socialists have interpreted "preparedness" as nothing but a capitalist conspiracy against the working classes. In making his choice between the Democratic and the Republican candidate, he would naturally select the man and the party which in his opinion would be most likely to make the country conscious of what it should prepare for, and to perform a good job in the practical work of preparation.

Finally whatever force the argument of our correspondents has applies to the task of a voter and not at all to the editorial policy of a weekly journal. THE NEW REPUBLIC does not vote. Its freedom from any obligation to make the sometimes hard choice of a voter does not mean that it will always assume a non-committal attitude. But any support which it may give to a political candidate will constitute the least characteristic and significant part of its work. Its business during a political campaign is to examine and discuss the incidents, the issues and the personalities thrown up by the political convulsion in the hope of shedding some light upon them, and perhaps of making the discussion contribute to the better understanding and wider acceptance of certain progressive political and economic ideas. The subordination of its discussion of the campaign issues to the support of a candidate whom it would not wish to see elected and of a platform in which it does not believe

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would be equivalent to intellectual suicide. It would be sacrificing its primary business of disinterested criticism to the unprofitable task of advising voters how to make what is at best an extremely questionable choice.

What Progressives May Ask of Mr. Hughes

AS Mr. Hughes begins his campaign, it is well for liberals to fix in their minds what they may fairly expect from him. Obviously they cannot expect a detailed outline of policies to cover the four years beginning March, 1917. No man can tell now with any accuracy how the problems of peace and the reconstruction will present themselves. In voting this autumn we are compelled to vote for qualities of mind, for general purposes, and for a party organization. We cannot vote for specific measures. In thinking about the Hughes candidacy we have to guess what kind of government we shall get out of the impact, through the Republican organization, of his intellect and character upon general conditions.

Put the matter in another way: Assume that Mr. Hughes is a man of extraordinary calibre, one who is fearlessly loyal to his own ideals, what are the ideals which inspire him? What are the underlying purposes which animate him? That is what his campaign will have to explain. And that is all he can usefully make clear between now and election. For we take it as settled that the Democrats cannot impugn Mr. Hughes's integrity or his capacity and that the Angel Gabriel cannot fill us with any love for the Republican organization.

Is he the "Kaiser's candidate"? In one sense the answer is simple. Only a fool supposes that Mr. Hughes is. And yet the fact of official German-American support raises one question with which Mr. Hughes is in honor bound to deal frankly. The essence of the German-American complaint against the President is that he coerced the German government into yielding on the submarine question, and has not coerced the British on the "blockade." The German-Americans are entirely right when they say that the Wilson administration has not carried out an even-handed neutrality. THE NEW REPUBLIC has supported Mr. Wilson in this unfairness because it believes that the world stood to gain by a neutrality which was benevolent to the Allies. The majority of Americans, though they have shirked the moral issue, acquiesce in this policy of discriminating neutrality. It is for Mr. Hughes to tell us where he stands on this question. Specifically it is for him to tell us whether he believes in the enforcement of the letter of the law against the Allies. A frank statement here will settle forever the question whether he is accepting "hyphenated" support under false pretenses.

In matters of foreign policy it will not be enough for Mr. Hughes to talk about upholding American rights and honor. We need to know for example whether in countries like Mexico Mr. Hughes would insist on technical American rights as the supreme issue, or merely as one issue in the larger question of reconstruction. Would he give Mexico a chance to find itself even at reasonable sacrifice of American interests, or does he agree with those who want intervention and conquest to uphold every right, no matter how obtained or how exercised? This is a fundamental question outweighing all matters of diplomatic technique. It deals with the deepest problem of American purpose in the Latin states. Mr. Hughes must let us know whether he understands imperialism and how it works.

On the question of preparedness we have a right to know from him what he regards as the main facts of our foreign relations. Does he stand for armed isolation, or does he recognize the necessity of a rapprochement with the British Empire in this hemisphere and the Pacific? How does he look upon the proposal for a "war after the war" by economic means? Here is probably the greatest issue he would have to deal with as President, and we have a right to know from him where the United States would stand if the attempt is made to perpetuate the schism of Europe. Then too, a clear statement is needed from him telling how he regards the plan to establish a League to Enforce Peace. On none of these points can we honestly expect a full outline of policy, but we may expect an indication of general purposes.

Mr. Hughes cannot satisfy liberals by talking in the traditional Republican manner about prosperity. Here we confess are our sincerest misgivings about him, for much of what Mr. Hughes has said since his nomination sounds distressingly like Mark Hanna Republicanism. A more specific statement is required of Mr. Hughes. That he is in fact an apostle of "prosperity" in the McKinley sense we of course do not believe. Mr. Hughes is not going to practise the creed of unregulated enterprise by captains of industry. But Mr. Hughes will understand that modern liberals ask something more than the regulation of predatory wealth. They insist that government interference with business shall take place not only to stimulate business but to improve the distribution of wealth. To put the matter concretely, the progressive to-day insists that if there is to be a protective tariff, the protection of labor shall not be left to chance. The Mark Hanna doctrine was:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Increase the prosperity to business, and prosperity will trickle down to the pay envelope. Experience shows this to be largely a delusion, and if Mr. Hughes is to justify progressive support he must advocate some administrative machinery in connection with the tariff so that the results actually do reach the wage earner. He must be prepared to use the tariff not merely to increase a statistical "prosperity" but to enforce better wage conditions in protected industries.

He should explain to us in the next few months whether he agrees with the principle that the cost of armament and of social works should be levied on riches by means of income and inheritance taxes, or whether he prefers indirect taxation of consumption through the tariff as the chief source of revenue. Nor can liberals be satisfied until they know whether English experience with labor unions has brought home to Mr. Hughes the lesson that labor organization is an institution of the modern state to be recognized and dealt with as an institution. Has he passed out of that discredited school of opinion which regards labor organization as a nuisance to be tolerated or suppressed, and does he see in it a legitimate interest and a great source of democratic intelligence? Does Mr. Hughes know that the solidarity of labor is to be encouraged, and that no modern socialized state can progress in which the organization of labor is not carried to a high degree of efficiency?

There, it seems to us, are the minima of a satisfactory campaign. Candidly dealt with they will reveal the basic assumptions with which Mr. Hughes approaches his task. If he is sound and liberal on these issues, he might justly claim the vote of progressives, and the American people could face the complexities of the future with the assurance that Mr. Hughes's great ability and fine courage were inspired with the necessary understanding.

The Deadlock in the Cloak Trade

AFTER the abortive conference between the Cloak Manufacturers' Association and the union, the situation remains exactly what it was before. The strike is still on; the union still wants a protocol, agreement or understanding with the employers; the manufacturers do not know what they want. In the meanwhile the losses due to the strike have increased, and sickness and semi-starvation have spread among the workers.

The situation being now entirely intolerable, some solution must be found. It is not merely a question of putting an end to the present devastating strike, but also of working out an equitable and reasonable agreement, of effecting an organization in the industry, and preventing the outbreak in the future of such senseless and futile conflicts. Unless the manufacturers and the union can agree upon a plan for an effective joint control of the industry, the old chaos which preceded the strike of 1910, will return, and sweat-shop conditions, wage-cutting, over-work and sporadic strikes will again become chronic.

It is probable that the average employer does not consciously desire any such disorganization within the industry. The manufacturer who is absolutely opposed to all "interference by the union" does not quite like the idea of running a sweatshop. He merely dreams of an ideal independence, in which he will run his shop without consulting unionists, social reformers and journalists. Doubtless he wishes to be reasonably "fair" to his employees, to pay them "what they are worth," and to work them at no greater speed and for no longer hours than the needs of his business demand. He really believes in a vague way, if he has thought about the question at all, that it is to the true interest of the wage-earners to be selected on the sole ground of efficiency and availability, and who is a better judge of efficiency than the employer, who profits or loses by the choice? In any event there must be discipline in the shop, and the employer, who pays the wages, must have the unqualified right to hire and fire, to reward the good and punish the lazy and recalcitrant. If a worker is not satisfied he has the option of leaving, if a thousand workers are dissatisfied they can all leave. In other words, the unrestricted power of the employer within his shop carries with it the correlative right of the workers to strike. It is a system of uncontrolled though possibly beneficent despotism based on the assumption of a constant if often latent industrial warfare.

The manufacturer, who thinks in this way, has no sort of sympathy with the revolutionary syndicalist. Yet though these two men are wide apart in their philosophies and detest each other cordially, they are forced in the course of day to day events to act upon exactly identical principles. The syndicalist rejects all the premises that the capitalist accepts. He believes that the entire industrial system, by which men make a profit from other men's labor, is uneconomic and immoral. The workers must take over all the means of production, not by the slow and devious way of political action but through a constant and increasing economic pressure, and above all by means of strikes. All binding agreements between employers and employees are to be avoided, for they dull the worker's revolutionary zeal and kill his love of conflict. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exploited workman must always be ready to strike and strike again, suddenly and without warning. Let the employer make what conditions he will, hire whom he will, discharge whom he will. If the workers are not satisfied they can strike. They can strike in any case.

Thus in the end these extremes meet. The employer who wants to run his industry in his own way and the revolutionist who wants to end capitalism by "direct action" both believe that during the course of the struggle each side must retain full liberty of action. The agreement between these two groups is not merely intellectual but temperamental. And each, from his point of view, has a reasonable philosophy and an arguable case.

It is because the Cloak Manufacturers' Association accepted this theory of a ceaseless conflict within the industry that any real and permanent agreement in the recent conference was out of the question. So long as manufacturers retain full authority and the wage-earners keep the right to strike, there is no possibility of enforcing any agreement which they may make upon any other subject. Both the manufacturers and the union seemed willing at one time during the conference to enter into some sort of arrangement relating to hours, wages and sanitary conditions. But no such arrangement would be worth the paper it was written upon unless there was machinery for its enforcement, and any such machinery would place a limit upon the manufacturer's control of his shop, and would at least imply a limitation of the worker's right to strike. For if prices were fixed too low, the workers by simply striking could overrule the decision. In the same way the employer, if he secured the right to discharge for any cause or none, could discriminate against unionists, and thus destroy the machinery which was to regulate conditions in the industry. The alternative was and is a simple one, either the old protocol with its preferential union shop and its prohibition of the strike must be restored in some form or other or the state of war must be reëstablished. A partial agreement, permitting strikes and discrimination, would in the end lead either to a protocol or to a reversion to war conditions.

This is the situation in which the sudden end of the conference leaves both parties. What may now happen can only be surmised. Perhaps the interrupted negotiations may be resumed, as similar negotiations were again taken up in the strike of 1910. Or a new pressure may be brought to bear upon the refractory employers.

The most obvious method of applying this pressure is to appeal to the President of the United States to appoint a commission to study this strike and effect if possible a settlement. It is hardly conceivable that the Manufacturers' Association would refuse to appear before such a commission, for in case of refusal the more liberal employers would secede from the organization. Much against its will the Association, after excluding the public from all participation for twelve weeks, has at last admitted that "the people should know at all times the true facts." If the manufacturers agree to appear before a Federal Commission the chance of a settlement is greatly increased.

In the meantime it is even more important to contribute money for the support of the union. The union treasury is empty and the strikers depend to-day as never before upon the far-seeing justice and generosity of the public. If the strike can be maintained the Association will be forced to agree to a settlement. The financial losses of the manufacturers are increasing and they run the danger to-day of losing their entire season. Moreover the Association is rent in two. The leaders, who control the Executive Committee, have never represented the entire association and to-day they probably represent only a minority of the members. If these leaders maintain their present intolerant attitude, there is hope of a secession of the more decent and intelligent manufacturers, the creation of a new association, and the establishment of a protocol between the new association and the union. If this can be effected the present Manufacturers' Association will become a mere vestigial appendage to the industry, useless and doomed eventually to disappear.

The issue remains what it was before, an organized industry with joint government and decent conditions versus a retrogression to the evil sweat-shop conditions formerly prevailing. It is a battle which is the affair of the whole nation, and it is a battle which cannot be won without money.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1916, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY
PHILIP LITTELL
WALTER E. WEYL
WALTER LIPPMANN
FRANCIS HACKETT
ALVIN S. JOHNSON

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FOUR DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES TEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FOUR DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, FIVE DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.

REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER. ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why We Have a Pork Barrel

ALL the interests and activities of the people, whether public or private, are affected by the manner in which their government raises and spends its funds. As was pointed out by the President's Commission on Economy and Efficiency in 1912, "The immediate relations of money-raising to welfare have been a subject of constant national concern since the days the federal government was organized. In fact, it reaches back through the Revolutionary period; it was one of the chief subjects of popular interest and agitation which culminated in the Declaration of Independence." In truth, it reaches back through the history of constitutional government to Magna Charta.

The only effective method that has ever been devised for the exercise of control over the purse in a representative government has been this:

> First: To make the executive responsible for the economy and efficiency with which the public business is carried on by requiring him to prepare and submit his plans in advance to a representative reviewing and approving body, and to make these executive proposals responsive to public demand by not permitting him to go ahead without the approval of a majority of the representatives of the people.
>
> Second: To make the representative body responsible to the electorate by limiting their powers of finance legislation to critical consideration, approval or disapproval of the plans and requests for authority brought before them by the executive—then in case a majority cannot approve to "go to the people" on the issue or issues raised.

This has come to be known here in contradistinction to prevailing American practice as an executive budget procedure. It is the only budget practice that is known to any other country; and it has been adopted because it locates responsibility for planning with those who are charged with the conduct of the public business; it provides for efficient executive leadership; it ensures the enforcement of accountability; it gives to each member of the legislature a chance to inform hmself by having the executive present to explain and defend each item as it is taken up by the legislature in committee of the whole; it makes the legislature responsible for the fidelity with which it reflects public opinion; it also places upon it the burden of making inquiry, review, criticism and discussion of every detail questioned a matter of public news. It is a procedure based on a long line of experience which carries conviction that just so soon as individual members of a representative body are permitted to initiate measures the management becomes irresponsible or wasteful, if not corrupt.

This was the concept of control which the framers of our federal Constitution had when they provided that "no money shall be drawn from the treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law," and gave to Congress the power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises" and "to borrow money on the credit of the United States." This was the thought that lay back of the requirement that the President "shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." The same thought was also in mind in requiring "a regular statement and account of receipts and expenditures."

But this method of control over the purse was not well guarded and has not been preserved—in fact, it has been completely ignored. In their anxiety to make the government responsive to the public will by providing that "all bills for raising revenues shall originate in the House of Representatives," and to give freedom of speech and debate, they had in mind the possibility of executive usurpation; but they did not make any provision against legislative irresponsibility and usurpation. They did not draw up a procedure which would require that executive estimates be taken up initially in committee of the whole with responsible executives present, as was the English constitutional requirement; they did not provide for protecting the planning powers of the executive or foresee the possibility of impairing the normal working relations between the executive and the representatives of the people. Instead of limiting the action of Congress to the financial plans and proposals prepared and submitted for their consideration by the executive they passed laws requiring administrative subordinates to submit requests to Congress without executive revision or review; and Congress through its committees took over the power both to prepare plans for future expenditure and to approve them. In so far as we now have any control over the purse it takes this form:

> Irresponsible committees of the legislature prepare and submit plans and proposals for money-raising and money-spending, all details of estimates being gone over in the committee room.
>
> Each committee and each member of the legislature is privileged to initiate finance bills without consulting the executive.
>
> Individual members of the legislature vote on money bills without opportunity given to ask questions of the executive, and without opportunity given to the ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> ecutive publicly to explain, discuss or defend his own proposals or to oppose those which have been worked out in secret in the committee room.
>
> After finance measures have passed both houses of Congress, and not infrequently after Congress has adjourned, the executive then is relied on to review, approve, or disapprove the final determinations of the legislative branch without opportunity for open public criticism and discussion of items; and if he disapprove them after the session has closed he may be forced to call another session with small probability that he will get any better result.

President Taft, commenting on what has come to pass during the time that the government has been operating under this perverted method of control over the purse, in a special message to Congress, February 26th, 1913, said:

> Although we are annually spending $400,000,000 for military purposes, including pensions, we have never had a comprehensive or consistent military policy. Nor have we as a nation had any plan for developing the many services which have been created to provide for the economic and social welfare. Bureau after bureau, service after service, has been organized, but neither the executive branch nor the Congress has been conscientiously working to a consistent well defined purpose. Not only have we not had a definite program for determining each year what welfare work should be undertaken or what should be the next step in promoting or conserving economic or social interests, but there has been the same lack of program in regard to our national finances and proposed expenditures.

President Taft proposed the adoption of an executive-budget procedure for the national government and claimed for himself the constitutional right to submit a definite plan and to become responsible for this plan before the people; he claimed for himself and his cabinet the right openly and publicly to explain and defend executive proposals. But this was resented by Congress, and the proposals which were submitted by him by special message did not receive the courtesy of consideration.

The Constitutional Convention at Albany last summer worked out an amendment to secure for the state of New York the benefits of executive planning and open public legislative review and criticism, but this proposition was lost with some forty other changes in the constitution submitted to the people at the same time. Governor Whitman then followed the example of President Taft so far as the submission of executive requests for appropriation was concerned and his measures met with a similar fate at the hands of a hostile legislative leadership. New Jersey has recently passed a law providing for an executive budget but has not changed its legislative procedure to make it effective. The Maryland legislature has passed and will go before the people at the next election with a budget amendment to the constitution similar in its main provisions to the one which was lost in New York. But it still has two contingencies to meet before favorable popular vote and the development of a procedure to make it a measure of substantial reform. The Maine government is now getting together a measure on the same lines as Maryland, and several other states are getting ready for the consideration of similar proposals.

Recognizing the insistent public demand for change, but with a view of continuing what President Wilson calls "congressional supremacy" in matters of administration, it is now proposed to cure some of the purely formal defects of a method that has been condemned and discarded by every great nation which has a representative form of government, by adopting what the defenders of these practices choose to call a "legislative budget." In its best form this means a so-called budget which in fact is nothing more than an appropriation bill prepared and submitted at the beginning of a legislative session by a legislative committee or commission which shall have the power to make inquiries and prepare estimates throughout the year. And the advocates of this expedient announce to the public that they are in favor of a budgetary method of handling public finances, but they are not in favor of a budget prepared by the executive.

The executive budget is the procedure of control over the purse that has been employed with increasing success by every country that has an efficient government and every nation that has a government which is responsible to the people; it is in harmony with the principles and precepts of democracy; it corresponds to the best practices that have been worked out in both public and private enterprises; it has been evolved by centuries of progressive experience in making management efficient; it makes the executive responsible for careful planning; it makes the legislature responsible for careful review and criticism of executive plans; it provides for full publicity in review and discussion of plans; and through this enables the people themselves to follow discussion and criticism, and makes the electorate effective in determining whom they shall trust with the conduct of affairs.

The so-called legislative budget has been urged for adoption by those who would protect the supremacy of the legislature and retain a weak executive in matters of administration—by persons who are opposed to executive leadership. In recognition of the popular unrest certain members of Congress and leaders in state legislatures are offering this as an "American" method of doing things in contradistinction to a "foreign" or "European" or "monarchial" method. The fact is that it is not American except to this extent: that America is the only great nation that is still continuing practices which European nations have had the wis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dom to get rid of after having suffered all the evils which we have continued to suffer for a century. Stourm in his great work "Le Budget" vividly portrays the result of giving to individual members and committees of the French parliament the right to initiate finance bills; and in this he tells the story of log-rolling methods and the "pork barrel" as faithfully as if he had been describing a session of Congress or of our state legislatures. In conclusion he says:

> From this resulted two great abuses: The open door for ill advised action, and the destruction of the equilibrium of the budget, the first causing the second. Such actions were inevitable from the moment each member was permitted to set out officially his reasons for asking an increase of expenditures or a reduction of revenues, as he might think wise or in behalf of his constituency. Such pleadings, carefully studied by their authors, masterfully presented, often with passion, stood a good chance of influencing the Assembly. In a general way, however, it should be noted how matters of taxation or public expenditures, treated separately, and without regard to general balances, can become misleading. A suggestion to increase the appropriation for some branch of the service in need, to increase the salaries of subordinate employees insufficiently paid, or to increase the pensions of former servants of the state or those of poor members of mutual aid societies, etc., to make an appeal to the generosity of the heart or patriotic pride of the auditors, is an easy way to achieve an irresistible success.

In this connection it is to be noted that for the first time in our history the word budget appears in the platforms of our national parties. The Republican and the Progressive platforms both take a firm stand for an executive budget, while the Democratic platform, in so far as any meaning can be gained from its words, indicates a desire to retain the initiative of finance measures in Congress. May not a lesson be drawn from the fact that the Republican leaders at Albany and Democratic leaders in Congress—leaders of the party for the time being in control of legislative branches—favor the continuation of practices that have been responsible for log-rolling and pork-barrel methods in every country where these methods have obtained?

FREDERICK A. CLEVELAND.

Beclouding the Minimum Wage

ECONOMISTS of to-day are extremely wary of the direct application of theory to practical problems—especially those involving the conditions of labor. They have taken to heart the fate that overwhelmed the reputations of the economists of an earlier generation who pronounced too promptly and too unequivocally upon problems of this character. According to the economic theory of the early nineteenth century, the prohibition of child slavery was wrong; the regulation of women's working conditions was wrong; trade unionism in all its manifestations was utterly wrong. "Thus saith the Lord," was the implicit exordium of the typical anti-labor manifesto. But labor reform proceeded nevertheless, and all that is now in doubt is the source of inspiration of its opponents.

The logic of economic theory has not greatly changed, and everyone familiar with this branch of thought knows that if pressed for a verdict upon the minimum wage, economic theory would deliver one that is unfavorable. This might be bad for the minimum wage, or it might be bad for economic theory. It is the latter alternative that has been most prominent in the minds of the majority of economists. That is why they have hesitated to match the minimum wage and economic theory in mortal combat. But now the match has been set. Professor Taussig in the current *Quarterly Journal of Economics* has presented as lucidly and cogently as is humanly possible the complete case of economic theory against the minimum wage.

The minimum wage movement is directed against industrial parasitism, say its defenders. Here is an industry that fails to draw its own weight. It employs girls who live at home, and who could not possibly live honestly on the earnings it affords if they were thrown upon their own resources. Or it employs children, skimming the vital energy derived from their nurture and then casting them off. Or it avails itself of the forces of state-supported paupers or prisoners. There is no need to illustrate further; the fact of industrial parasitism is familiar enough. What is there that is objectionable about it? Excepting the case of the child laborers worn out and cast aside, is it not better that girls living at home, wives not occupied in family duties, persons detained in public institutions, should earn a little rather than nothing? To be sure, and difficulties arise only when parasitism spreads over so wide a range that persons who have no outside means of support become obliged to submit to its conditions. This is patently the case in many of the industries employing women. Girls living at home are paid six dollars a week. Girls not living at home can get no more and they starve on it. The situation is one demanding remedy, if the anaylsis is correct. Professor Taussig makes show of demolishing it, but what he does is merely to raise

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the question whether the girl who lives at home and receives six dollars is a parasite, and whether the industry, in so far as it employs her, is parasitic. But this is merely a lexicographical question. The pertinent facts are that workers in these industries could not live decently if they could not draw upon other sources of income or avail themselves of the small savings in expense that come from family coöperation, and that in the nature of the case many women must find themselves in these industries without such relief. They are few—not more than one in five—says Professor Taussig. Only one in five working from dawn to dark for less than a decent minimum of subsistence. Perhaps even less, for Professor Taussig guesses that the unattached single women are more often above the average than below it. Very likely, but we cannot afford to have even one woman industrial worker out of ten starving, and the other nine just above the line where sickness or death in the family would plunge them into destitution. This is not a parasitic phenomenon? Very well; it remains undesirable, and the society that has much of it is in a bad way.

Still, for the girls living at home six dollars, or even five or four, is better than nothing, is it not? Yes, if, as economic theory assumes, labor were perfectly mobile, shifting readily for every possible gain, like the world's wheat or gold supply. But labor is not mobile, and often the most inadequate wage, to be had very near home, will outweigh a much better wage at no considerable distance. Six dollars a week is something a girl will not readily let fall from her hands, even if much better pay were to be had at the cost of a few weeks' preliminary training. If the parasitic trades were to be abolished altogether, it still would not follow with certainty that the girls now employed by them would not in the long run be better off. But nothing so drastic is anywhere contemplated. All that the minimum wage movement proposes is to force up the level of pay in these industries until it is adequate to cover the needs of the willing worker, whether or not he has independent means, whether or not he can draw upon relatives for support, whether or not he happens to be a member of a family group and can live more economically than he could alone.

Some industries, especially women's industries, do not do this now. Suppose that we compel them by law to pay eight dollars a week instead of the six they now pay. This, according to Professor Taussig's economic theory, would have a two-fold result. It would reduce the number that could be employed. It would increase the number desiring employment. We should have higher wages for those employed. But we should create a new problem of unemployment. We should increase the happiness of the favored ones employed, and aggravate the miseries of those excluded from employment.

Why should fewer women be employed at eight dollars than at six dollars? Because the higher wages would in the long run produce an increase in the price of their products. And an increase in price reduces the volume of demand. Such, in outline, is the theory.

Let us consider first whether this rise in prices is really inevitable. According to economic theory, if the cost goes up the price must go up. And according to the same lore, when wages go up, costs go up. For, again according to economic theory, we are living under a régime of intense, universal competition, which cuts prices to the level of costs. And our industry is directed by shrewd, far-seeing men, who already manage their labor force as well as they can and pay as high wages as they can without forfeiting their profits.

It is not to be denied that the hypothesis of perfect competition has proved useful in the handling of many economic problems, especially those relating to currency and to wholesale prices. The hypothesis becomes less and less useful as the facts of price-making depart more and more widely from the hypothesis. Prices, as paid by the final consumer, are far from any competitive standard. The Standard Oil Company fixes the price of gasolene at what the traffic will bear — well above the cost level. If costs were to rise the price might not rise at all; the traffic would not bear more on account of the rising costs. Five-dollar shoes are so priced because the traffic will bear five dollars. Raise the wages of shoemakers, and the five-dollar shoe will not sell at five dollars and ten cents. The price will probably remain at five dollars and the extra cost will be subtracted from the profits of the manufacturer or the jobber, or the retailer—wherever charging what the traffic will bear is practised. Somewhere, along the road from the producer to the consumer, almost every commodity falls into the hands of a functionary who adds to its price what the traffic will bear. If the costs are higher the addition will be less; if lower, the addition will be more. Thus an advance in costs is likely to be absorbed before it ever reaches the consumer and affects demand. Especially is this true when the advance in costs is small. In most of the industries that live by the labor of underpaid women wages make up only a minor part in the total costs. An advance in wages of twenty-five per cent would rarely mean more than a five per cent increase in total costs, even if no increase in efficiency followed the rise in wages. In the circumstances, we have no real warrant for assert-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing that a rise in women's wages from six dollars to eight dollars a week would raise prices to the consumer and curtail demand.

But even if we granted that any actual increase in cost must make its appearance in the price exacted from the consumer, what ground should we have for assuming that an advance in women's wages to a living level would mean an actual increase in costs? Low-paid labor is often dear labor. For a hundred years practical economists have known that the weak point in modern business practice is the handling of labor. A successful manufacturer will go to any extreme of trouble to determine the qualities of the various materials and fuels he may use. He knows exactly how much he might gain or lose by substituting fuel oil for coal, electric lighting for gas. He knows exactly when the shiftings of material prices and the prices of finished products make it desirable for him to put a little more cotton into his fabrics and a little less wool, or vice versa. He has calculated with the utmost nicety the relative advantages of selling at low prices for cash or at higher prices on time. In short, the modern business man is miraculously clever in handling the material and financial elements in his calculations. But when it comes to the personal element, his fingers are all thumbs. For years he will maintain conditions of employment such that there is a constant coming and going of laborers, though commonsense admonishes him that only the laborer who remains month after month yields profits. When men can do more work, week in week out, on an eight-hour schedule than on one of ten hours—an exceedingly frequent case—you would think the employer would find it out. Not so: he has to be driven to it by law or by trade unionism, and he is as much astonished to find that he has gained by the change as though there were not recorded thousands and thousands of similar gains forced upon other employers. When men will do twice as much work on three dollars a day as on two, the employer ought to be the first to find it out and beg his men to accept higher wages. He never does. He has to be bullied into raising wages even to his own advantage, although there are bulky books by men of his own class filled with instances of the economy of high wages. For this ineptitude of competent men in the handling of labor, nothing is more responsible than the disposition among business men to regard labor as a commodity, like any other. But this is also the disposition of economic theory. The results are no more satisfactory in theory than in practice.

But grant the unemployment. We, the people of America, decree that we will have no industry, we will permit no employment, except at living wages for all classes of normally employed workers. We discover that we have not enough jobs, under the imposed conditions, to go around. Unemployment emerges everywhere throughout our industrial system, in spite of all we can do in the way of rearranging our labor forces. Is this the final outcome of our endeavors? By no means. Here, as in so many of our labor problems, we must take into account the effects upon future labor supply, especially upon immigration. By Professor Taussig's own admission, the root of the evil of underpayment of unskilled labor, and of women's labor specifically, is immigration. Immigrants and the children of immigrants make up the mass of those most cruelly sweated. Now, if we allow no employment except at living wages, and already have more laborers on the ground than we can employ at such wages, how many immigrants shall we have? Only those can come who are efficient enough to take living-wage jobs away from persons already here and eagerly seeking them. The conclusion is irresistible. A nation-wide living wage might at first produce unemployment, but in the long run, chiefly in consequence of the check it would give to immigration, the slack would be taken up by the natural development of industry. We should have everybody employed at living wages. Possibly our population might not be quite so great, but a smaller population living in health and decency is worth more than a greater population exploited and miserable.

Why is it that Professor Taussig, after formally stating his acceptance of the superior importance of long-run effects, leaves out of account entirely the effect of the minimum wage in controlling the supply of labor? Because the economic theory which he is presenting is essentially static. It assumes out of existence changes in supply of labor along with so many other vital matters that stubbornly exist nevertheless.

We have no early prospect of nation-wide minimum-wage laws. State laws we have, and there is no economic reason, save in a theory built upon assumptions contrary to fact, why they should not be both successful and salutary. The newer states are as yet practically without slums, sweatshops, factory populations ground down into misery. Through minimum-wage laws they can keep such evils from ever getting root. Every manufacturer who has in contemplation the erection of an establishment in such a state will have to calculate on whether he can pay the state minimum. Every worker who contemplates removal to such a state will have to calculate on whether he can earn the minimum wage. The inefficient employer who lives by grace of starvation wages, the inefficient worker who thankfully accepts crumbs, will avoid such a state. Development of industry may therefore be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

slower; it will certainly be sounder. It will not be less in the long run, for in the long run efficiency is cheap.

Either the minimum-wage principle is unsound or the conventional economic theory, when applied to such a problem, is fallacious. That is what Professor Taussig set out to prove, and he has proved it. Economic theory has been applied to a problem beyond its competence and sadly exposed —an end well worth while, scholastically. Thus the mediaeval logician used to prove to his disciples that the greater is less than the smaller, that black is white, that murder is brotherly kindness. The logician was not seeking to subvert the common-sense of his disciples; he was merely showing them what logic was capable of doing. In one respect the practice of the mediaeval logician was superior to that of Professor Taussig. All his disquisitions were in Latin; therefore they did not float away from their proper field to bewilder and mislead laymen unfamiliar with the logician's game. If he had written in Latin, Professor Taussig would simply have illuminated economic theory. Writing in English he has also beclouded the minimum wage.

ALVIN S. JOHNSON.

The Feminist's Age

IF you could have lived in some other age, what one would you have preferred? It is an interesting choice with which to while away idle moments. The determining factor is, naturally enough, your sex. Some ages were distinctly men's ages, others decidedly women's. Agnes Repplier has written some charming essays on the happy half century for literary ladies. But if I were a feminist, there is one great glorious period for which I would have been preëminently fitted and which I could never quite console myself for having missed—that golden age of free women, the time of Arthur.

What amusing inversions of the eighteenth century romance the Arthurian legends present! No helpless maidens, struggling through three volumes to preserve their virginity against the untiring efforts of monotonously dissolute males, but a band of innocent men in the clutches of as determined rakes of ladies as history has ever recorded. No wonder that the name of Galahad, the maiden knight, has gone down to fame, when one reflects on the desperate nature of the women who surrounded him. It was an age in which no one from King Arthur down was safe. If one of these vigorous females once took a determined fancy to him, there was hardly any power on earth that could save him.

And the situation was peculiarly pitiable from the fact that as well as being the age of feminists, it was also that of chivalry. This left the men absolutely unprotected. It was a frightfully hard position to be in. They could fight it out with other men, but there was really no defense they could use against a woman.

These strong-minded ladies—more especially the bachelor girls, but frequently the wives and mothers—spent a large share of their time riding round the country on horseback. Men were their natural prey, and they would station themselves at points of vantage and deliberately lie in wait for errant knights. One of the many examples occurring to me regards three good young men, who went off on one occasion, seeking adventure. Hardly were they well started when out dashed three ladies upon them, one fifteen years of age, one thirty, and one actually sixty. Cutting off all escape, they demanded that the young men part company, each taking one of them. What could the poor fellows do? They had to break up their pleasant party, and each saddle himself with a lady. The first to choose took the feminist of sixty, hoping, doubtless, that she wouldn't demand so much of him. But she undeceived him soon enough, dragging him all over the country from danger to danger, and proving absolutely tireless in her desire for excitement. Age could not wither the inclinations and activities of these ladies. It only rooted them more and more deeply in their gay free ways.

The life of a man like Launcelot was really hardly worth living. Because of his great reputation, the efforts of the women were doubled, and if he relaxed his watchfulness for a moment, he was lost. And yet the poor wretch could never bring himself to do anything actually unchivalrous, no matter how often a victim of their treachery. Early in his career he was abducted by four queens, one of them no less desperate a character than Arthur's sister, Morgan le Fay. When they got him safely into a strong castle, they lined up before him, and resolutely commanded him to choose between them. Being ardent believers in free love, the fact that they were all married women was, naturally, no deterrent. Launcelot protested solemnly that he didn't want any of them. But he might have known that his words would be wasted. Wholly unmoved, they clapped him into a dungeon until he should yield. He held out for months with the most admirable steadfastness, and I like to think that he could have resisted until death. Certainly no alternative but death would have released him, had he not, by a happy chance, been enabled to effect his own escape.

Poor Launcelot! It was only the beginning of his trials. What he suffered thereafter at the hands

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of ladies would touch an unfeministic heart. And always his chivalrous nature prevented his profiting by experience. They would demand that he do the most ridiculous things, and he invariably consented. One, for instance, begged him to climb a tree after her hawk. He obeyed without a murmur, although climbing was distinctively out of his line, and necessitated shedding all his armor. Thereupon the lady called out her husband in full fighting trim to fall upon the knight when he came down. I cannot but feel this to have been a tactical error; for, armor or no armor, Launcelot was a match for the lady's husband and vanquished him gloriously, departing in triumph. She should have trusted to her own powers, and seized him herself. There would have been nothing he could do about it then.

And there was no step in the accomplishment of their purpose at which these women balked. When throwing themselves repeatedly at a man's head, and using every measure from impassioned pleading to physical force proved fruitless, they did not hesitate to stoop to such means as knock-out drops. Launcelot's fall at the hands of "the fair ladye Elaine"—not the lily maid, whom he was able successfully to elude, but the other Elaine—was due entirely to her managing to drug him. As for Morgan le Fay, whom I mentioned before, she was a past mistress in the black arts, and could enchant most young men as soon as look at them. A female Don Juan, she was a perfect scourge at court, and caused all sorts of anxiety to Arthur, who felt that he really ought to make some effort to remove such temptations from his knights, but was uncertain how severe measures to take. The unfortunate king had cause enough thereafter to rue ever having interfered with his sister's amours, for he incurred her lasting hatred.

Now, unhappy as you were to have these women love you, you were as good as a dead man if they hated you. Morgan le Fay began as spirited a series of attacks on her brother's life as I have ever read of. Her great knowledge of necromancy was turned to the keenest account, and Arthur began to receive a series of ingenious presents, all designed to make a dreadful end of him. Burning shirts and poisonous food came in rapid succession, so that he must have hated to hear the doorbell ring. And yet what could he do about it? No more than he could when Vivien shut up Merlin, his chief advisor, in a tree. The women had the men utterly at their mercy to kiss or to kill, and they knew it.

If you gave in without a struggle to the highwaywoman who was after you, you were spared years of agonizing resistance, and obtained certain advantages; but you were placed in a very degrading position. You remember when the Lady of the Lake got Pelleas well out of Etarde's clutches, what a lap-dog she made of him. He never could budge from her side, and was allowed to enter tournaments only on special occasions when she thought there was no danger of his getting hurt. And he had formerly been a mighty man of valor!

There were doubtless some among these ladies who marked out men rather as intellectual companions than as objects of their love. Percival's sister was of this kind. A short-haired, strong-minded person, she made a dead set for Galahad as soon as he was old enough to get out in the world. But she did it in an unusual way, rarely mentioning love, but talking continually to him of his purposes in life, and shaping them for him as far as she could. Yet though so conservative by comparison with some of her sisters, she was no slave to convention, as was shown by the way in which she dragged Galahad on board her ship, and sailed away with him. And she kept him for one mortal year, drifting around, all alone on that ship with her, while she had her say out with him. Probably she would have hung on to him indefinitely but for the fact that she died.

Yes, it was an age of free women. They dashed into Arthur's most private councils or most illustrious assemblages with the demand that some knight leave immediately to do a piece of work for them—usually the killing of some other poor knight—and Launcelot or Gareth or Tristram or Bors or Percival had to leap to horse and follow, regardless of the fact that Arthur might need him more than did the lady. These women roved the country at will, from the most tender years to old age, seeking whom they might devour, and once they had marked a man for their quarry, heaven have pity upon him, for they had none. They occasionally ran up against a wicked knight, who would capture some thirty or forty of them, and keep them under lock and key in his castle, but they never had to stay long, for some hero was sure to learn of their plight and ride to the rescue. They would then receive all their former captor's treasure by way of recompense—the deliverer, by the rules of good form, being strictly debarred from keeping a penny of it—and could boast of an experience quite as good as two weeks in Holloway jail, that made them interesting martyrs for life. How natural it seems when we read that the dying Arthur was carried off on a barge by three queens. Even in death no man was secure. And when we learn that one of these queens was Morgan le Fay, we can have only the darkest forebodings of the fate in store for him.

The centuries have passed since then without the pendulum's ever having made the full stroke, without the feminist wave ever having reached that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

highwater mark. There are strong hopes for the twentieth century; it is beginning with such a powerful swing—or cresting, whichever metaphor you prefer. But I doubt if it will reach the age of Arthur. I cannot but believe that it will stand through all generations as the lost golden age which can never return.

HESTER A. HOPKINS.

Albert the Male

IN college Albert achieved the right club after many nights of worry, and a rather strenuous campaign conducted by his mother. I saw something of Albert in those days when we were freshmen together, and he was always cordial when we were alone. In public he did not know me so well, and there were times in the month before his election when he did not know me at all. I did not mind, for I knew that election to the club meant all the difference between success and failure. Albert could have lost his degree and laughed about it with the feeling of a good loser, but the club he required to give meaning to his life. He "made" it, and was never afterwards seen without the striped necktie which was its mark. No other ambition troubled Albert in college. Though he had a fair musical aptitude, he never joined the student orchestra because members of his club had never joined it. The orchestra as a matter of fact was composed of earnest and declassé nobodies.

After graduation Albert entered his father's bank and was elected to the right club. From these two foci Albert gathers all the opinions he displays. Of course he has never known it. Albert is not the sort of person to admit that opinions, like people, have a birthplace, a family tradition, and a basis in income. Whatever Albert believes he believes to be self-evident. There is not a touch of insincerity in him, for it is entirely beyond the range of his mentality to realize that what everybody says at the bank and the club is not a norm of sanity and decency.

When everybody at the club cursed Roosevelt as a socialist, Albert cursed him. Now that everybody at the club admires Roosevelt, Albert is wondering whether to join the reinforced infantry division for service in Mexico. One public man Albert has consistently admired. He speaks of Elihu Root with awe. Albert says Elihu Root is the ablest living statesman, but I am prepared to stake my fortune on the assertion that Albert cannot name and describe any event, good, bad, or indifferent, in Mr. Root's career. Albert knows no more about the life work of Mr. Root whom he reveres than about Viscount Haldane whom he has been sneering at the last year or so with extraordinary bitterness.

He calls Haldane pro-German and suspects Mrs. Asquith of coddling the German prisoners in England. I tell you this to indicate that the great war has not found Albert wanting in imagination. As he says, Civilization is at stake. The war has done much for Albert's opinions. When it began he spoke of democracy as the hope of the world, and cursed the docility of the German Socialists. He advocated revolution in Germany and everlasting peace on earth. War, he said, was nothing but murder—cold, brutal murder and rape. As the months dragged on he met a number of Englishmen and Frenchmen at his bank and his club. Albert felt a little out of it. He took to hating Josephus Daniels. He began to believe that the Germans were about to capture and hold New York for ransom, and his mother registered both the motor cars with a society which was prepared on the outbreak of war to carry gold deposits and virgins away from the coast cities. Soon a stream of expatriated Americans began to return telling how America was despised in Europe. This worried Albert and he began to talk of American honor. By reading the New York *Herald* steadily he gathered the impression that outside of Boston, Philadelphia, and New York the country consisted of money-making cowards, pacifists and pro-Germans. It irritated him beyond measure to think of Iowa farmers buying Fords. He called it materialism, and blamed Woodrow Wilson for it.

At cotillions and bazaars, and at the horse show, he discussed the loss of American virility, the love of soft ease, the incorrigible pacifism of the American workman and farmer. He felt troubled about America. Then came Albert's trip to London and Paris. I fear that I cannot do it justice, for those two weeks mark Albert's crystallization as a leader of thought and action. In London Albert went out to dinner four times and to a week-end party, and this experience convinced him that America was a cheap place. He could not phrase it exactly, but he missed the noble touch. These new countries, full of money-makers, thought Albert. . . . By force of imitation he read Oliver's "Ordeal by Battle," and of course he read the London *Times*—*The Times,* he called it. Then he knew the remedy, and when he returned home he preached it.

What America needs is universal service. Platts-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

burg for everybody most of the time is his ideal, and a complete philosophy of life it is. Prepare for war because war is God's purge for the degeneracy of peace. Prepare for peace because only the invincible nation can insure peace. Hard physical work, says Albert, will educate for citizenship, industry and morals. All perplexities have left Albert, not a very surprising thing, however, when you remember that he has never had many perplexities to trouble him. Now at least he feels himself competent to formulate a diplomatic policy, an educational system and a moral discipline. A professor who has studied banking thirty years Albert regards as a theorist about banking. But a rookie who has nursed sore feet thirty days at Plattsburg is now a mystical authority on foreign affairs, national destiny, and on the obligations of citizenship.

This is Albert to-day, and with this equipment he faces the future. He is going to be very rich and his power is sure to be very great. He will be quoted in the newspapers. He will dine with editors and statesmen. Albert is one of those men who have power thrust upon them, and his opinions will carry more weight than a million humbler men's.

As I look back upon Albert's education I can't help trembling a little. Those nurse girls, valets, chauffeurs and butlers who encased his youth, that school where the ideal was a gentleman who had brushed against dead languages, the college course insulated in the best club, the bank where he met his own kind, the dances and week-end parties where the social inbreeding is almost incestuous, have given Albert a sense that his world is all the world. I worry at the thought that he will grow up to govern, whether in office or out of it, to govern industry and to influence politics, to command the loyalty of America. It is distressing to think that he and his kind will have the power to cause antagonism or friendship with other nations, and that his stubbornness and blindness may turn the coming revolution into a disaster. I have no great faith in Albert. I think it is the Alberts who ruled Europe and brought it to ruin. I think it is the Alberts of Eton and Oxford who have compelled England to muddle in blood, as it is the Alberts of Prussia who thought blood and iron were the instruments of destiny.

I know Albert for what he is, a charming, well mannered, unconscious snob, who knows nothing of men outside his class, an uneducated, untrained, and shut-in person who has been born to power by the accident of wealth. You see I don't think with the socialists that Albert is a malevolent, intelligent conspirator with a hard heart. He is not malevolent, and he is not intelligent.

W. L.

The Apotheosis of the State

WE are the creatures of authority and there is thus something of splendor in a defiant challenge to its power. Rebellion, for the most part, hardly enters into the categories of our political thought, and it evokes bewilderment rather than sympathy. For rebellion, after all, is fundamental. It goes to the root of our philosophies of the state. Where we have placed that society outside ourselves, have made the rejection of its authority treason, and death the penalty for its failure, there can be no argument save upon the basis of belief.

Samuel Butler has somewhere remarked that it is only the small things of life men are prepared to investigate, and certainly the student of political theory will not feel disinclined to avow the allegiance of that genial satirist. For we have been frank and unquestioning worshippers of the state. We make our Popes infallible, nor can our kings do wrong. Before them we prostrate ourselves in speechless admiration, deeming their action for the most part beyond our concern. The result has been the implicit acceptance of a certain grim Hegelianism. The lack of unity bewilders us, and it is an integrated community that we demand. That is admirable so long as the integration confines itself to purpose. The difficulty comes when it seeks its translation to the sphere of institutions. For then we are led to deny the goodness of all who are not ourselves. The state, to take the most obvious example, becomes a kind of modern Baal, to which the citizen must, unheeding, bow a willing knee. It has not been seen, or perhaps has been too truly seen, that the death of argument is in genuflexion.

The attitude is very manifest in Germany at the present time. Unquestioning acceptance of government command has become the first rule of self-preservation. Good, even if it involve the torpedoing of passenger ships without warning, is that which the state ordains; and variation from so uncritical a mean seeks a vain permission to exist. At bottom the suggestion is a too fatal certainty of rectitude, a confidence that there is no other good but one's own. And the danger becomes the greater when doubt is felt lest a varied civilization may have its possible value. For the difficulty implicit in such a view lies in the fact that we are given variety and scepticism as the basis of international relations. We have not, as in some ghastly human sheepfold, a pathetic and unprotesting uniformity. Englishmen belong to England, and the constancy of the Irish racial type has lately found tragic verification. So we would have Americans, Frenchmen, Germans, work out their own

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

destined salvation—if salvation be their lot. Each has its own peculiar ethos, and, so far as we can historically understand, the goodness of humanity draws sustenance from the independent vigor of its constituent parts. They, it is clear, are rivals, industrially, socially, politically, even in things of the mind.

It is the rivalry in outlook that becomes clear when you contrast Fustel de Coulanges with Brunner, Taine with Ebbinghaus, William James with Mr. F. H. Bradley. Yet, ideally, at least, that rivalry is the rivalry of friendship and not of enmity. It is, ideally, also, to be governed by the accepted canons of human intercourse. *Homo homini lupus* has long ceased to be true of the individual world; and, as Lord Acton so earnestly argued, it must be upon its removal from the sphere of international relations that the emphasis of future endeavor must be laid. That is the strength of America's position in the present conflict: that her law knows no necessity. That is the moral weakness of the German contention that her needs should involve the subjection to themselves of the one sure principle—as experience has made manifest—of political progress.

It is an inadequate attitude, fraught with the most hapless of tragedies; and its history is written in the wrecked lives of men and women. It is possible to think differently. It is possible to cease muttering vaguely useless phrases about the struggle for existence, and to ask ourselves steadily upon what conditions humanity can permit that struggle to be fought and—the question has yet to be faced—against whom it is to be waged. We urge, for example, that no possible consideration of expediency can remove the warfare between England and Germany from out of the sphere of moral law. States are persons as men are persons. They have—the word matters but little—their ethos, character, identity, nature. They are born to live a life in the fellowship of nations as men are born to live in the fellowship of men. They are subject to the rules of conduct which the process of human experience has developed. They may be wrong as men and women are wrong; then they must be so judged. The answer that the state has no conscience, that in a crisis the thought and soul of the individual must be absorbed in the national life, is to place authority before truth. We dissent emphatically from its coronation.

It is not, as some urge, self-discipline thus to sacrifice one's individual belief to the judgment of the whole. Where men begin to surrender their beliefs at the cost of suffering, monotonous regularity will cause them to surrender their most cherished convictions without a pang. From the invasion of Belgium to the sinking of the Lusitania acquiescence followed with little pain; and it is regrettably clear that the opinion of humane men condones the barbarity of submarine warfare. Rather let us follow our state where by its rectitude it demands our sympathy, as the policy of Lincoln won for the United States the stern appreciation of her citizens. But we must not fail to register our disapproval where we deem its error crime.

Our state, then, is to be but doubtfully sovereign, and what seems the securest dogma of political thought in this modern time is thrown, wantonly as some would say, to the winds of a sceptical heaven. Yet let us realize that the dogma of state-divinity has a history and we shall the more easily recognize that the cause for its acceptance has passed away. One Martin Luther, four hundred years ago, nailed ninety-five theses to the walls of Wittenberg Church, and yet Leo X continued to live the life Medicean Popes mistook for Christian. If from Rome no satisfaction was to be derived, then will our monkish enthusiast appeal to imperial power, and tell young Charles, who has but begun to taste the sweets of kingship, that the empire is no less God-given than the supreme dignity of the papal crown. Luther, in fact, created for the modern world the divine right of kings; and when kingship paled before the rushing tide of democracy in seventeenth century England, and eighteenth century America and France, the divinity passed from kingship to the state of which kings were the symbol. It was, in fact, a dogma forged in one of the mightiest of political conflicts as a sword to strike Rome. But dogmas, even when they have been successful, dare not hope for immortality.

It is from this thought that the state is sovereign that we have come to regard it as beyond the moral law. For since it is the creation of God, it seems to us sin that we should fail, by whatsoever means we have at hand, to secure its survival in an hour of crisis. We refuse to admit that on occasion it may not be worth while to die. The dogma, then, of a morality of states lower than the morality of men—the dogma which makes of espionage a virtue, and of the diplomatic lie a splendid sin—must be cast aside. We are living in an age of reconstruction. This which has failed to stand the test of modern knowledge we must reject—for faith in the past without thought for the future can end only in catastrophe. We must—to take our greatest present problem—evolve a sure basis for international law that shall be impermeable to the dissolving current of state necessity.

It will be said that disapproval passes into re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bellion imperceptibly and that our rule gives us no criterion for justifying such change. Yet surely the test is a pragmatic one, and it is by its fruits that we shall judge of its worth. We say, for instance, that America was right in 1776 where the South was wrong in 1861; for America strengthened the cause of liberty where the South would have prostituted the name of freedom to the cause of slavery. And what of Ireland to-day? We cannot tell. Only this of a certainty we may declare, that a protest so striking and so tragic must bring as its consequence a readjustment of fundamental principles. Had that protest gone unvoiced it may be that a clear right to self-government would have gone unsatisfied, and that it is therein the future will find its deepest meaning.

The one thing of which we may be certain is that no state which has acted with uprightness need fear the transition from criticism to revolt. "Let the colonies keep the idea of their civil right associated with your government," said Burke in the greatest of his speeches, "they will cling and grapple to you, and no force will be of power to tear them from their allegiance." That is true of the citizens of the modern state. A faith that is based on right conduct is a faith that is surely grounded. For it erects the temple of justice upon an eminence, and only in death is it capable of desertion.

HAROLD J. LASKI.

The Way of Germany and the Way of Mexico

"MY dear sir," said the man with the practical idea to the humble Historian, "the trouble with the German people is the House of Hohenzollern. They gave Germany an efficient government but it was not the right kind of government."

"Suppose, however," I tried to answer, "that the German people were contented with what they had. Suppose they liked to be well fed and to see their children well educated, and get a pension when they are old, and go out of an evening and take the whole family to hear Wagner for the price of a single glass of beer. Suppose they liked it and did not ask for more."

The answer was an indignant outburst of righteous indignation. The system was wrong. Every intelligent Anglo-Saxon knew that the system was wrong. An ultimatum was laid down in direct terms. "No man ought to be contented with a pension and a free school and cheap music and general prosperity when he has no hand in the administration of the government. There are higher things in the world than efficiency and material wellbeing. There is a democratic form of government. Every nation should be obliged to practise self-government, however badly it does it. The Germans do not have it. Their country is an example of efficient civil administration but it is not self-governing. It must be destroyed. It is a danger to the rest of the free world. Germany cannot hope to exist as a civilized nation until the Hohenzollerns shall have been removed."

Intermission of three minutes and silent smoking.

"My dear sir," said the man with the practical mind to the humble Historian, the trouble with the Mexican people is the absence of the Diaz régime. Carranza is trying to give Mexico some sort of democratic self-government, but it is not the right kind of government."

"Suppose, however," I tried to answer, "that the Mexican people were contented with what they now have. Suppose they liked to be their own masters and to own a bit of land some time or other. Suppose that they did not like to be efficient and hated foreign methods and hard work for the benefit of an investor in Timbuctoo. Suppose that they would rather have a single pair of trousers, a hat, a wife, five children and do nothing all day long than work for sixty-three cents and increase the country's revenue by slaving ten hours a day. Suppose they like what they have now and do not ask for more."

The answer was an indignant outburst of righteous indignation. The system was wrong. Every intelligent Anglo-Saxon knew that the system was wrong. An ultimatum was laid down in direct terms. "No man ought to be contented with a form of government which does not actually govern but dillydallies in a sort of socialistic way towards the millenium of self-government. A nation like Mexico never ought to have self-government. The country now is an example of disastrous ruin brought about through too much of this so-called self-government. It ought not to be tolerated. It must be destroyed. It is a danger to the rest of the efficiently governed world. No nation has a right to exist which does not increase the material output of the human race to the best of its ability. Mexico can not hope to exist as civilized nation until the ancient Diaz régime shall have been reëstablished.

Intermission of three minutes and silent smoking.

"My dear sir," said the man with the practical mind to the humble Historian, "the trouble with the German people is the House of Hohenzollern. They gave Germany an efficient government but . . ." etc., etc., *ad infinitum*.

HENDRIK WILLEM VAN LOON.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

Would Swell Socialist Vote

SIR: To the logical non-Socialist of radical tendencies, your attitude, or lack of it, on the presidential election seems far from effective.

In your issue of June 24th you express dissatisfaction with Democrats and Republicans, both candidates and parties. Of the four, you find the Republican candidate and Democratic party preferable. You therefore advise your readers to assume a non-committal attitude for the present on the assumption that large numbers of uncommitted votes may inject into one party or the other some sense of the social and industrial readjustments needed in the country. You object to voting the Socialist ticket because its candidate is not fit to be President and because any administration that acted on its program would land the country in disaster.

But why should you view the Socialist party in the same light in which you view the two parties, one of whom will inevitably win? The lack of logic in so doing is manifest.

If you encourage your readers to vote the Socialist ticket you will help to achieve your avowed purpose.

A million votes added to the Socialist party will not endanger the country; it will go a long way towards liberalizing the two old parties.

Such a suggestion to your readers would seem to be more politically astute than asking them merely to delay the process of allowing one or the other of the old parties to betray them once more.

"LIBERAL."

Washington, D. C.

Apostates from Realism?

SIR: "THE NEW REPUBLIC believes in administrative improvements, in social legislation, and in trades-unionism, not merely as palliatives, but as actual steps in the direction of a coöperative commonwealth." So runs a leading editorial of June 24th. But, it continues, "we are prevented from supporting the Socialist ticket because its candidate is not a fit person to be President and because any administration which acted on its program would land the country in disaster."

This is to me a most unfortunate betrayal of THE NEW REPUBLIC'S high trust—realism in political thought.

You say that your refusal to support the Socialist party in this campaign rests on your fear that Mr. Benson and his party may actually win at the polls. But is it conceivable that a party which totalled but a little over 900,000 votes in 1912 should poll over 5,000,000 in 1916—especially a party of such revolutionary aims? To the realist the answer to this question should dispel all hesitancy on the grounds of Mr. Benson's possible failure as a chief executive and the obvious disaster of a socialism decreed over night.

The betrayal would not be worth mentioning, however, unless it went deeper than these inadequate reasons for refusal to support the Socialists. It goes to a fundamental misunderstanding of the function and use of minority parties in social and political evolution.

From the Bismarckian social-insurance law of the 'eighties down to the enactment of reforms by our own Republican and Democratic parties which were previously urged by Populists, Progressives and Socialists, history has been piling up proofs of this principle of political science: progressive measures have been wrung from conservative governments by the fear of a radical, and usually hopelessly minority, party.

It is a clear-eyed understanding of this law, it seems to me, that should mark out political realism from the drab conventionality of the usual idealistic illusions. The hard-headed progressive votes and agitates for the party which will carry to the conservative powers-that-be the most apprehension and constructive suggestion. If such a party is in the minority, the personal ability of the candidates to hold office and the immediate practicability of their entire program are merely academic speculations.

Now that the Progressive party is dead there is but one party that can fill the requirements. If your desire for the "coöperative commonwealth" is genuine your refusal to support the Socialist ticket in this campaign is an apostasy from the realism that has hitherto been your greatest strength.

EVANS CLARK.

Lower Argyle, Nova Scotia.

Hold on to Socialism

SIR: As one of the "homeless radicals" of whom you have spoken much of late, I have been greatly interested in the policy of watchful waiting which you are advocating, and especially your condemnation of the Socialist party. When there is only one decent hotel in a town I do not ignore it and stop at an indecent one simply because the decent hostelry doesn't suit all my tastes, nor have I left the church although I feel keenly its social inadequacy. With all its faults the fact remains that the Socialist party is the only organized political force which offers any sort of a radical diet. Simply because the Progressive party has been swept aside by forces beyond our control, must we who thought we saw the light in 1912 march patiently once again to the shambles of political corruption as represented by the fatted Taft, Penrose, Barnes, and their ilk, or be forced to choose as the one alternative the ultra-partisan "democracy" of Wilson?

I hold no brief for opportunism, but unconditional surrender is abhorrent. The Socialist party may not be all it might be—not many of our human institutions are—but it certainly offers more to the "homeless radicals" than does any other party. A heavy Socialist vote in November will do more to open the eyes of the two older parties than all the howling we could possibly do if we joined with them.

And here is where the Socialist party finds its real mission. Like Socrates it must be "the gadfly of the State." Here too it appeals to the radicals now orphaned by the late Chicago fiasco, for it is working not so much for mere party success at the polls as for the principles that made us sing "Onward Christian Soldiers" four years ago. If our revolt is going to mean anything more than a four-year sulk, we must hold on to our radical beliefs and put them into some sort of action. I can see only one possible way of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

doing it, and that is by throwing our thoughts and votes in with the one political organization that shows any respect for radicalism.

CARL I. WHEAT.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Loyal to Our Kultur

SIR: In THE NEW REPUBLIC for June 24th, Professor Alvin S. Johnson contributes an interesting but to my mind decidedly confusing article—"Mexico in San Antonio."

Professor Johnson reminds us that we do not judge the Italian and Russian races on the basis of the exclusive study of some of their more wretched communities. We study them rather in an environment in which they have had a fair chance. And he rightly insists that we ought to be equally fair to the Mexicans. Whereupon he proceeds to describe the Mexicans of a Mexican colony in an American city after they have been educated in an American school by an American schoolmaster of exceptional wisdom and tact. And he finds the Mexicans who come out of this schooling possessed of many admirable qualities.

It is, to say the least, doubtful whether any race should be judged by what it proves to be in a foreign setting. Certainly we should not think that the best way to estimate the Russian race, for example, would be to trace the history of a Russian colony in a German city, even if we found that the Russians so situated had reached a higher degree of civilization than those who had remained in the fatherland. But waiving this consideration, the argument may at least be taken to prove—if this needs proof—that the Mexicans have not been by nature bereft of all good traits, and that they make desirable immigrants. It is, however, evidently intended by the writer to bear more directly on the problem of our present relation to Mexico, and it is even suggested that Uncle Sam should be to the Mexicans in Mexico what his schoolmaster has been to his colony of Mexicans in San Antonio. And, indeed, the logic of his argument forces the conclusion that to give the Mexican race a fair chance, Mexico should be in, or under, the protection of the United States.

And yet Professor Johnson evidently does not intend to accept this conclusion, for he asserts that we Americans know only the methods of clumsy diplomacy and brutal materialistic exploitation; and he arraigns us as a race for being "unsocial" and "unkind." This all too common habit of seeing the bright side when looking abroad and nothing but the dark side when looking at home is not a sign of modesty, but simply of crooked vision, and it is only one degree better than the jingoistic attitude which reverses the process. The charge is plainly not true when brought against the Americans either as individuals or collectively, or even as a nation in its dealing with other nations, as our record with Cuba and in the Philippines proves. And it is particularly unfortunate to have it brought forward at this time. Has any nation ever been as kind and altruistic in dealing with smaller and less fortunate nations? We do not want to go into Mexico. But, if we are forced to do so, we must go in to stay. It is intervention or annexation; and we ought now to frankly recognize this fact. It will save us from many embarrassments in the end, and it is greatly to be regretted that the administration at Washington has tried to give the opposite impression. If we go in, disperse a few bands of bandits, sacrifice many lives, and retire only to have a recurrence at the end of a few weeks or months of the old intolerable situation on the border, the folly of our present enterprise will vastly exceed the folly of Vera Cruz.

It is not, in spite of the imaginings of our devotees of peace at any price, the monied interests that are driving us to firmer action in Mexico. It is the voice of justice at last making itself heard. The citizens of the United States living on the southern frontier have as much right to the backing of the entire country in the protection of their lives and property as have the citizens on the northern frontier, or in the more sheltered sections of the land.

An intolerable situation exists on our southern border and, as the President has made plain, has existed for more than three years. It must stop. There is nothing to arbitrate here. It cannot be stopped until order is restored in northern Mexico. The Carranza government has shown its inability, or unwillingness, to bring about this result. We therefore must. For, to paraphrase the words of Lincoln, America cannot exist half savage and half civilized.

CHARLES M. BAKEWELL.

New Haven, Connecticut.

Are We Smug?

SIR: "Such a contiguous civilization we might have in Mexico in one generation if Uncle Sam could be to Mexico what Mr. Knox is to the little brown boys and girls in the Navarro school. This is impossible, you say. Why?" So asks Mr. Alvin S. Johnson in his article, "Mexico in San Antonio."

Because Mr. Knox is the exception, not the rule. Because there is no reason to believe that Uncle Sam could do in Mexico in one generation what he has failed to do with the Mexicans in the United States. Because a single generation of public schooling does not constitute civilization. Because many generations of such schooling have not made *us* sufficiently civilized to recognize the virtues of alien civilizations or cultures or racial temperaments which may or may not be inferior to our own.

When Mr. Johnson speaks of the "adobe hovels" of the Mexicans, he probably has an ideal of cleanliness in his mind, but it does not occur to him to mention that the adobe architecturally, and in its adaptation to the climate may surpass other forms of buildings. I speak of this because here in Santa Fé, the adobe style of architecture is much more beautiful and more livable than the atrocious suburban residences put up by the Americans. Also because since the American occupation many of the old missions, built of adobe, and antedating by more than a century those of California have succumbed to American innovations or improvements or to wanton destruction. And, of course, something of the same sort will occur in Mexico in the event of American intervention. Of course, the Mexicans hate their houses, under the influence of American sentiment. In other words, we have destroyed their taste. For the Mexican adobes are not merely picturesque; they are architecturally beautiful, with *placitas* and *portals,* carved wooden *vigas* (or roof-beams), and carved wooden capitals in which the art of the Spaniard and the art of the Indian are combined.

Of course, this is only a single instance of our failure to recognize the virtue of another culture, but to me it is symbolic. We need to do more than take our hat off to the Mexican flag. If we need "a contiguous civilization to enrich our life," it is too bad that that very element annexed and absorbed by us has done nothing of the sort.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If Mr. Johnson wants his investigations to carry weight, he should go deeper than a single generation of public schooling; he should show us the Mexican in the United States *after* he leaves school. Also I would suggest that Santa Fé, being further from border influence than San Antonio, would be a good place to conduct further investigations.

It is the American belief here that the Mexican is an inferior race. I do not know. But I know that it gives every appearance of being a *servile* race, due of course, in large measure, to the attitude of the dominant American race, whose ideals are so largely commercial. Outwardly at least, in physique and in bearing, the Indian is superior to the Mexican.

In business and in politics here the Mexican is said to be untrustworthy. When I asked if this were not in self-defense and due to the influence of American politicians the rejoinder was that if the Mexicans were not a weak race they would not succumb to such influence!

It seems to me that there is far too much smug hypocrisy in our attitude, too much blind faith in what we *can* do for the Mexican people. It is equally important to ask ourselves what we *have* done for them within our own boundaries.

AN AMERICAN.

Santa Fé, New Mexico.

Separate Invitation—Not Divorce

SIR: The most valid criticism I have received on the suggestion made recently in THE NEW REPUBLIC in my article "Must We Have Her?" in regard to separate invitations to the married takes this form: "In marrying each other we decided to live together all we could—we want to share each other's lives all we can. If we didn't want this, we should get a divorce. But as long as we *are* married, and as long as our married life is for us the principal thing, we want to put that first. Now we haven't much time that we can spend together, owing to business, etc., but at least we can make a point of not going out to parties separately. Even if we don't see much of each other at the party it's one more experience in common."

The separate invitation would not keep a couple from "going out" together nor compel them to go separately. They might be asked to the same party. When both were not asked the one invited might decline. Nor is there any reason why they should not let their acquaintances know that they like to be asked together. Such a desire in the case of two persons not married is sometimes quite well known and for the most part met. As a host why should one not try to gratify the genuine personal tastes of the married as well as of the unmarried? It is only the institutional habit we feel in this case no special call to support. In entertaining our friends, personal predilection we are generally disposed to humor.

But what of the married persons who do not enjoy going out together, perhaps under special circumstances, perhaps for the most part, and who nevertheless do not wish a divorce? Should their feelings be tolerated or should they be told, "Whether you want to go out together or not, you must, otherwise you must get a divorce?" Not dining together might then be added to the causes for divorce. Legal terminology at least would be fairly well prepared for this measure, changing its antique phrase, divorce *a mensa,* etc., to divorce *causa mensae.*

The separate invitation would give freedom of choice to both conjugal types—to the wholly devoted type and to the independent or perhaps less simple type. It would also give freedom to those who, whatever their conjugal relations, value other social relationships.

It is in connection with these relationships that the separate invitation really matters. The married, whatever their type, may be expected to regulate their conjugal relations to suit themselves. They can go out together or not as they please. If they do not happen to agree about it that too is a private matter. There is no reason why outsiders should step in—as they do now in the etiquette of the joint invitation—to back either one or the other.

Is there not every reason, however, why the rights of outsiders should be respected? Can they not be more easily respected under an etiquette of separate invitation?

ELSIE CLEWS PARSONS.

New York City.

The Snobbish Nice

SIR: I should like to address to your readers a disquisition against "niceness."

Rebecca West might have given "niceness" as the peg on which elegance is hung. Niceness, to change the figure, is the final prop of stand-pattism in its worst unreasoning form. It is a bourgeois bulwark behind which lazy, self-interested, and unimaginative men and women cringe. Women especially seem prone to throw themselves into this particular dungeon with its refined fetters of elegance. But men, cornered by danger to their own prejudices or desires, rush no less frantically to its shelter.

Recently I have stepped from a "nice" college into the wage-earning class. I do not regard this as a descent or a fall. So far as I can see I have come into contact with nothing dirtier than printers' ink, an innocent material much maligned, or shoddier than wood pulp paper, which alone makes a newspaper in reach of almost everyone. But this view of the matter is not shared by my friends.

My first encounter with the hydra was when I went to get some information from a lady who lay languidly in bed, wearied by the social exertions of the day, as she told me of her pet charity. "Why does a nice girl enter such a fearful life?" she asked me pityingly, and only respect for my newspaper kept me from sticking out my tongue to confirm her suspicion that all members of the Fourth Estate are hoodlums. Two weeks later an elderly dame interrogated me on my past, then remarked to a third person that she was sure I was a nice girl because my family, with whom I have lived only during brief vacations during the last five years, knew such nice people. A few days afterward I went home for a visit. A little circle of acquaintances in a middle-western city raised both hands, one hand, figuratively speaking, gloved neatly in white for afternoon calling, the other begrimed by contact with seldom-mentioned steel mills and said: "My dear, is newspaper work nice for a girl? If you must do it, why don't you choose some nice thing like society or women's clubs? And anyway, do you think it's nice for a girl to leave home and earn her own living, if her family can support her?"

I am immersed again in printers' ink. The worst of the situation is that if ever I should make a success of my work they would say: "Well, I suppose that if you have a nice family behind, sometimes it turns out all right."

M. E. R.

New York City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books and Things

WHAT did I not so much expect as wish for, what time my eyes first beheld the title, "American Men of Letters: Their Nature and Nurture," a pamphlet written by Dr. Edwin Leavitt Clarke, Assistant Professor of Economics and Sociology, Hamilton College, and published by Columbia University? Under "nature" I hoped to find a miracle, the revelation of those differences in ear and eye and brain which made Emerson unlike Hawthorne, and William James unlike his brother. Under "nurture" I hoped for pure crude facts about the diet of American men of letters. Have Florida oranges exerted a beneficial or a malign influence upon American abstract thought? Did Poe eat oatmeal for breakfast, or did he prefer whatever may have been the equivalent of grape nuts a hundred years ago? "What porridge had John Keats?" Did our greatest writers work at night, like Balzac, or all the time, like Flaubert? Idle questions, all of them, to which Dr. Clarke, whose conception of "nurture" is ampler than a dietarian's or a cook's, wisely returns no answer.

Even after I discovered that Dr. Clarke was dealing not with our exceptional men of letters, but with all of them, my wishes were as unreasonable as before. I desired many pages of confessions distilled into one perfect page of statistics, with a table which would tell me at a glance how many American men of letters had been driven to their trade by economic pressure; how many had drifted into it because theirs were vagabond natures, and because the necessary plant could be installed at a cost so pathetically low; how many were betrayed under promise of liberty, and lived and died reproaching their too, too credulous hearts. How many American men of letters had been reclaimed? And these few regenerate ones, did society treat them helpfully, or by its coldness and inhumanity push them down again into the ink of iniquity? No answer anywhere in Dr. Clarke's pamphlet. The life secrets of L. C. Tuthill, J. P. Durbin, G. Lunt and E. A. Gayarrée are as safe with his impartial reticence as those of O. S. Fowler and E. H. Chapin, of D. S. Durrie and I. D. Rupp.

In spite of these omissions, every one of which is relevant to Dr. Clarke's design, his pamphlet abounds in interesting informations, at the head of which I should put this fact, that the number of American men of letters "born [before 1851] and brought up within the present borders of Continental United States and Canada, in homes and schools where English was spoken, who did their work in the English language," is—how many guesses do you want? The number is one thousand, cool and round. It would be unfair to Dr. Clarke, as tending to lessen the plot interest of his most engrossing pages, to say how he discovered either this fact, or this other, rivalling the first in power to startle, namely, that of these thousand two hundred and forty-seven were exalted above the merely meritorious rank and file. One tip, however: "We possess a criterion for men of letters, which is relatively easy to ascertain, and whose value cannot be contested. It is simply the diffusion of their works." Thus Odin, quoted by Dr. Clarke.

"As a result of the method employed" in picking the thousand and the two-forty-seven, says Dr. Clarke, "the slightest good faith on the part of a student suffices for the attainment of a high degree of objectivity." Granting this, I beg to suggest that a yet higher degree of objectivity might have been attained if the same method had been employed upon a subject matter slightly different. The inherent interest of this pamphlet would have been greater had the author chosen, instead of American men of letters, to study American trotting horses or shortstops. Instead of the tables he actually gives us we should have had tables like these, very alluring: Absolute and Relative Numbers of American Shortstops of White Race, Born Within the Present Territorial Limits of Continental United States and Canada Posterior to 1875. American Shortstops, Classified by Conjugal Condition, by Period of Birth, and by Median and Persian Number of Children Born to Them. American Shortstops, Classified by Sex and Rank, by State or Province of Birth, Together with the Relative Fecundity in Shortstops of Each State or Province."

In Dr. Clarke's chosen field, no matter how vigilantly he tends it, a subjective weed is likely at any time to appear. This danger is as much less in the field I wish he had chosen as the ease of distinguishing a shortstop from a southpaw or a backstop is greater than the ease of distinguishing a man of letters from a mere journalist or parson. Nor would the adoption of my suggestion have exacted too high a price for the resulting increment of objectivity. Dr. Clarke's work would have been more widely diffused. His most general truths would have been just what they are now: "In the first place . . . not all persons whose environments are good succeed in rising above mediocrity. Again . . . many persons do achieve success whose environmental conditions are extremely unfavorable." And I doubt whether he would have found, had shortstops been the victims of his patience, much to alter in his "final conclusion drawn from the data of his study, namely, that while without natural ability no person achieves success, lack of opportunity may exercise an absolute veto on the aspirations of persons possessing such natural ability."

My own most general conclusions, based upon a study of Dr. Clarke's treatise, are mainly two. First, that Dr. Clarke is a painstaking man and a modest, as modest as the conclusions to which he has made his toilsome journey. Secondly, that in the presence of any fact he is very, very humble, as President Wilson and others might say who are free-handed with their veries. To fact after fact Dr. Clarke obtains the right letter of introduction, and has it delivered by a sure messenger. In each case the same ritual. The Fact having signified that she will be graciously pleased to grant him an audience, and having named a day, Dr. Clarke enters the presence at the appointed hour, kneels, kisses the hem of Fact's garment, receives her blessing and deferentially withdraws.

Dr. Clarke, however, has done more than to help me reap these conclusions. He has sown in me the seed of fear. What will happen when next I pick up a treatise on anthropoids, prehistoric man, ants, wasps or what not? Remembering these thousand men of letters, of whom two hundred and forty-seven had talent in their day, and of whom only a handful rose high above the mediocrity to which the others rose, shall I not be tempted into foolishness? "Away with these mediocrities!" I can hear myself saying it. "Of what interest are the nature and nurture of the common ruck? Tell me rather the sensations and ideas of the egregious ant, the parentage of the wasp who distinguished himself above his fellows by discovering how to fly through a window-pane."

Imlac, who had been talking about men of letters, was interrupted by an exclamation from Rasselas, Prince of Abyssinia: "Enough! Thou hast convinced me that any human American may hope to be a man of letters." "To be an American man of letters," said Imlac, "is indeed very easy." "So easy," returned the Prince, "that I will at present hear no more of his labors."

P. L.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Commonwealth of Greater Britain

The Problem of the Commonwealth, by Lionel Curtis. New York: The Macmillan Company.

AMONG the political problems which have waxed acute as a consequence of the European war, not the least fascinating and momentous is that of British imperial federation. The great catastrophe has revealed both the imposing strength and the insidious weakness of the British Empire. It has been proved prodigiously strong in the loyalty of the inhabitants of its self-governing Dominions, in the sacrifices which they have been willing to make for the defense of the Empire. But the very fullness of the testimony which they have given on behalf of imperial integrity has only thrown into sharper relief a grave defect of organization. The Dominions, whose inhabitants have testified so abundantly to the value attached by them to their British citizenship, have never been wrought as self-governing communities into the structure of the British commonwealth. In one essential respect they are deprived of the right of self-government. They have nothing to say about the British imperial policy which has involved them in so much loss, bloodshed and suffering.

The legal standing of the self-governing Dominions in the British Empire is anomalous. They have been described by one British statesman "as sister states equals of the United Kingdom in everything except population and wealth," and by another as "each master in their own household, a principle which is the lifeblood of empire, *articulus stantis aut cadentis imperii.*" These descriptions exaggerate the autonomy of communities, which may have their laws vetoed in London, but with one important qualification they are substantially true. Canada, Australia, South Africa and New Zealand and Newfoundland have gained almost complete control over their domestic affairs—very much more nearly complete control than has been granted to the constituent parts of any federated state. They frame their own tariffs, and their own legislation as to the admission or restriction of immigration. The more important of them, it must be remembered, are not provinces. They are groups of provinces constituting in many respects genuine nations. They have the variety of resources, the complexity of economic life, the feeling of joint responsibility, and the sense on the part of their inhabitants of being similar to one another and different from the rest of the world, which are essential to nations. Yet in one decisive matter they have less to say about their national business than have the inhabitants of an American state. They are nations with a domestic policy only. They exercise no control over the imperial military and naval establishment. They can be involved in war which they may not like. They must consent to treaties of peace with which they may not agree. Their political relation with the rest of the world is decided for them by ministers responsible only to the Parliament of the United Kingdom.

Previous to the coming of the great war the anomalous relationship between the United Kingdom and the self-governing dominions had provoked a good deal of discussion but not very much active concern. The statesmen who wished to federate the British Empire had considered the matter as an economic rather than as a political problem. The old arrangement was working well enough. Canada was a nation without a foreign policy, but the majority of Canadians did not consider themselves damaged and were not troubled by the deficiency. They were being guaranteed against attack by the navy and army of Great Britain; they were relieved of a heavy expense and an onerous responsibility; and many Canadians refused in theory to accept any obligation to follow Great Britain into a war. Sir Wilfred Laurier, for instance, has repeatedly expressed this conviction. On the other hand, there were certain signs of dissatisfaction. The proposals made before the war to build a Canadian navy had resulted in the clear assertion by Sir Robert Borden of the principle that "when Great Britain no longer assumes sole responsibility for defense on the high seas she can no longer undertake sole responsibility or sole control of foreign policy." It has taken the war, however, to bring this occasional and not very serious dissatisfaction to a head. After it is over, the Dominions will naturally claim some participation in the determination of a policy, the maintenance of which has forced them to assume such terrible burdens. The problem of devising some means of control is one of the most dangerous and difficult which has ever been presented to a group of self-governing nations for conscious solution. Yet if its solution is shirked the British Empire will, in the opinion of some of its most ardent friends, be frankly inviting the alternative of dissolution.

Even before the war, the problem of British imperial federation in its political aspect was receiving intensive consideration from a body of earnest and laborious political thinkers. As far back as 1910, groups of men belonging to all political parties were formed in various centers in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and later in India and the United Kingdom to study the imperial problem. They came to be known informally as "Round Table groups," deriving their name from a quarterly maga-

TIFFANY & CO.

CHINA AND GLASSWARE
LATEST IMPORTATIONS

FIFTH AVENUE AND 37TH STREET
NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

zine which some of the members of the English group began to publish as a medium of information about imperial affairs and of discussion of imperial problems. After an exhaustive preliminary study, which served to develop certain general lines of agreement and disagreement, it was decided shortly before the war to prepare a brief separate report on the most essential aspect of the imperial problem. The report was intended to answer the question of "how a British citizen in the Dominions can acquire the same control of foreign policy as one domiciled in the British Isles." The result is a volume which has just been published by the Macmillan Company, entitled, "The Problem of the Commonwealth." The report is written by Mr. Lionel Curtis, and is published on his own exclusive responsibility. It has profited enormously from the studies made by the Round Table groups; but Mr. Curtis himself was obliged to decide what to accept and what to reject out of the mass of material furnished by the studies. The solution of the problem, proposed in the book, must be credited to Mr. Curtis and to him alone. His associates on the Round Table group agree with him only in part, but inasmuch as they are trying to arouse popular interest and to create popular discussion they have consented to raise a sharp issue by the publication of a definite solution rather than submit a merely indeterminate discussion of the problem.

Mr. Curtis's project for a Commonwealth of Greater Britain can in its essential aspects be briefly described. After very properly rejecting the plan of admitting Canadian and other representatives into an Imperial Parliament which should remain in control of the domestic affairs of the United Kingdom, he proposes to constitute an exclusively Imperial Parliament in which the inhabitants of the self-governing Dominions can be represented. The new Parliament would have exclusive control of foreign policy and of all the administrative services required to carry out a foreign policy. The Foreign Office, the Admiralty, the War Office, the India Office, and the Crown Colony branch of the Colonial Office together with a ministry of Imperial Finance are to be represented in the Cabinet which would be the executive organ of this Imperal Parliament. The new legislature would be endowed with all the powers now exercised through those offices as well as with the power of voting the funds which in its opinion would be necessary for the conduct of foreign affairs and public defense. It could be created and its authority accepted by the younger Dominions without altering a single word of their existing constitutions. Their inhabitants would be merely securing a new control over foreign policy and its necessary instruments coupled with a new liability for their share of its cost. But the same statement would not apply to the people of the British Isles. The proposed reform would involve a drastic change in the systems by which their domestic affairs are regulated. They would have to accept local Parliaments, subject to an instrument of government similar to the British North America act of 1867. These and the other proposed changes would have to be embodied in a formal act of the existing Imperial Parliament—an act which, if passed, would in effect become a written constitution for the Commonwealth as a whole. But Mr. Curtis does not wish to leave the drawing of that act to any committee of the existing Parliament. He proposes nothing less than a constitutional convention, whose work would have to be approved by the electorates of all the Dominions before or after being ratified by the Imperial Parliament.

The Commonwealth proposed by Mr. Curtis differs from all previous federated states in one essential respect. The central authorty in a federated state has always been endowed with control over foreign policy and its necessary instruments, but it has not for that reason abandoned control over questions of domestic policy. Those which are supposed to concern the commonwealth as a whole were committed to the central government. Those which were supposed to concern chiefly the inhabitants of the separate provinces were committed to the organs of local government. But no such classification is possible in the case of the self-governing constituents of the British Empire. Canada and Australia possess and will insist upon retaining substantially complete control over all their domestic affairs. They are in reality separate nations, and the problem of combining them into a commonwealth is clearly and essentially a problem of international organization. Thus the proposed British Commonwealth, if it ever comes into existence, would constitute a really novel political creation. It would be more than a nation, but different from an empire. The federated bodies politic would remain masters of their own households, yet they would be organized into a community; and the government of the community would be no less the master of the police force, the highways and the external business of the greater city. It would in fact constitute a super-national democracy—a commonwealth not only of free men and women but of free nations.

Mr. Curtis is an eloquent, a persuasive and a forcible advocate of his Commonwealth of a Greater Britain. He has placed political thinkers throughout the world under an obligation by his powerful statement of the problem presented by the organization of a super-national democracy and by his ingenious and earnest advocacy of a particular solution. If the British Empire can be reorganized as he proposes, the classic political conflict between an empire and a republic will begin to look less formidable. As a successful example of a genuine community of free nations the British Commonwealth would offer both an illuminating and an inspiring example to other peoples. We Americans would be particularly interested in it, because it might provide a political mansion, hospitable enough to include a visitor which is as jealous of its autonomy as is the United States. Indeed, there are indications that Mr. Curtis and his associates are suggesting the possibility of nothing less than an organized political catholicism, in which the free nations might find the opportunity for steady internal growth which is denied to them by the existing political protestantism.

However vain or prophetic these more ambitious hopes prove to be, of one fact there can be no doubt. The political controversies and experiments of the British Empire during the next generation are likely to become as full of meaning and, we hope, nourishment for other peoples, as were the early English essays in free government, or the constructive work of our own critical period. Somehow and sometime soon the civilized world must tackle the problem of an international organization which seeks to become more than an alliance, but less than an *imperium*. It looks as if the British Empire, just because it constitutes in part an organized community of self-governing democracies, and just because it may disintegrate unless it works out some practicable form of union, will become in the near future a political laboratory of altogether exceptional interest.

In the near future, however, the British, Canadian and other self-governing parts of the Empire are not likely to go as far as Mr. Curtis believes to be indispensable. The method of imperial organization just described is proposed, as I understand it, not as a tentative suggestion but as the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TEN years ago factory whistles tore the air of peaceable communities to shreds; today the workers carry Ingersoll Watches.

The Man Behind the Counter

There are Ingersoll Watches for everyone: Little ones, big ones, watches to be carried in the pocket; to fit on the wrist; to stand on the desk or table; to go into ladies' handbags; to be fastened beside the bed or the stove in the kitchen; the new "Radiolite" that tells time in the dark; in all twelve different sizes and kinds from the famous Dollar Watch to the new thin, 7-jeweled, accurate, bridge-model Reliance at $3.00.

On March 25, 1916, the following advertisement appeared in The New Republic:—

"Was Henry Lane Wilson concerned in the plot to assassinate Madero? Ever since President Wilson took office, and before, hundreds of thousands of people in the United States have wished they might get more real inside facts about the Mexican situation.

"Why was President Wilson so intense in his feelings about Huerta?

"Was our own Ambassador, Henry Lane Wilson, concerned in the plot to assassinate Madero?

"The time seems to have come to tell this story. It begins in *Harper's Weekly* for March 25th. This story will take several weeks to tell. It is as exciting as a novel. It consists of documents and personal experiences. A long time has passed since an equally important contribution to inside dramatic current history has been made by any periodical."

The foregoing was published as a matter of business routine. It is needless to say that it was not intended by The New Republic as a reflection in any way upon the official or personal conduct of Mr. Henry Lane Wilson. The New Republic regrets that anyone should have found in the foregoing advertisement anything derogatory to Mr. Wilson.

The Editors.

DURAND
Steel Lockers

THE next time you buy lockers *specify* Durand Steel Lockers, and you'll get an equipment that will give you real service and satisfaction.

Durand Steel Lockers are absolutely *fire-proof*, practically *indestructible*, *clean* and *vermin-proof*. They increase efficiency by giving your employees proper facilities for health and comfort.

Our new catalogue will show you the various types we manufacture. Write for it today.

We are also manufacturers of steel shelving, steel bins and general steel factory equipment.

DURAND STEEL LOCKER CO.
1506 Ft. Dearborn Bk. Bldg. Chicago
906 Vanderbilt Bldg. New York

INTERLAKEN A School on a Farm
"Where boys learn by doing" SCHOOL

Thorough instruction in sciences and languages. Prepares for all universities. Academic work applied in practical agricultural and mechanical training. The school, located on a 700-acre farm, with its own electric light, power plant, wood and metal shops, makes two hours of useful work each day part of the school course. Boy leadership. Self-government under university-trained men counselors.

Summer Camp Mid-June to September 1st

For particulars and catalog address
Headmaster, Box 120, Rolling Prairie, LaPorte Co., Ind.
Chicago Representative, 'phone Kenwood, 4375.

Now, CYPRESS, the Wood Eternal, is the Champion Pergola lumber—you can see why. The same goes for arbors, trellises, sleeping balconies, (dahlia stakes might be mentioned) and pasture fences. Also for Colonial doorways. Likewise barns. Not to mention Library Interiors (with sugi finish) and humble kitchen sinks that don't warp. CYPRESS is "some wood," all right.

All-round Helps Department

Southern Cypress Mfrs.' Ass'n
1255 Hibernia Bank Building, New Orleans, La.
1255 Heard Nat'l Bank Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formulation of certain minimum requirements to which a Greater British Commonwealth must necessarily conform. There must be an Imperial Parliament created by an imperial convention, responsible to an imperial electorate, with exclusive jurisdiction over foreign policy and its instruments but with jurisdiction over nothing else. To an American Mr. Curtis's minimum requirements are open to the objection of taking too much for granted. Not being ourselves accustomed to parliamentary government and having reason to doubt its ultimate necessity, we are likely to be sceptical about a form of international organization which starts with parliamentarism as a major premise. But the initial difficulty of the average Englishman or Canadian would lie along different lines. He would inquire first of all how the proposed plan would be likely to work. The imperial government would, of course, need the support of a fairly permanent majority of the Parliament. Where would such a majority be obtained? Would the representatives from Australia, Canada and Ireland vote as separate groups? Or would parts of each national group be divided from its fellows and united with parts of other groups by party ties? Would it be possible, that is, to organize a responsible party system which would pervade the United Kingdom and all the self-governing Dominions? And if so, how would it articulate with the partisan allegiances and enmities on which are founded the existing governments of Canada, Australia, South Africa and Great Britain?

These questions are suggested, not because I have any intention of trying to answer them, or because they are unanswerable, but for the purpose of bringing out the obvious difficulty with Mr. Curtis's plan. He assumes that the Canadians would come into the British Commonwealth as individuals, that in their relation to the Commonwealth they would allow their nationality to be submerged. Perhaps the assumption is justified; but it is a large assumption. Judging by what we know of the past behavior of national consciousness, it obtains its liveliest and most stubborn expression only when relations with other nations are involved. The Canadians have dispensed with a foreign policy hitherto, but if they begin to feel the need of a foreign policy, will they not wish to have it assume a partly national, rather than an utterly and exclusively imperial character?

The alternative plans which have been suggested as methods of control by the Dominions over imperial policy provide for representation of the self-governing Dominions upon an Imperial Administrative Commission of Foreign Affairs. These representatives would be members of the Dominion Cabinets and would be responsible to their colleagues in Ottawa or elsewhere—that is, to the government of their national groups. In case of disagreement with the imperial policy by a Dominion, the representative could be withdrawn. The difficulties of such a plan, are, of course, no less obvious and serious than the difficulties with that of Mr. Curtis. The Commonwealth would not in its relation to the Dominion have the authority of a government; it would be only an areopagus. Canada could nullify a measure of imperial policy just as South Carolina claimed the right to nullify the laws passed at Washington. The plan seems, consequently, sufficiently unsatisfactory; but unsatisfactory as it is, does it not express the facts of the actual relationship between the Dominions and the Empire? Will not the local electorates and Parliaments remain the only righteous source of political authority in the Dominions? Even if an Imperial Parliament were constituted, could it or would it force a recalcitrant Dominion to obey its decrees?

The answer given to the last question in the last paragraph is decisive as an expression of opinion in favor of Mr. Curtis's plan or its competitor. Mr. Curtis insists that the imperial government should have the same right to enforce its decrees in the Dominions that it has in the imperial Dependencies. On the other hand, the exercise of constraint by the imperial government, not, of course, on individuals but upon any group of individuals who were supported by their Dominion government would be scarcely conceivable. Canada could not be forced into submission as the North crushed resistance in the South during the Civil War or as Canada would crush a rebellion by the province of Quebec. The cases are different. An independent government in Quebec would be utterly disconcerting in its effect upon the political future of Canada. But Canada is already supposed to be master of her own household; and if she were coerced the Commonwealth would no longer be composed of free nations. The Commonwealth could, of course, legitimately exercise an indirect coercion on a recalcitrant Dominion by withdrawing from it the shelter and the privileges which it obtained by virtue of its membership in the Commonwealth, but such penalties might drive her out of the union instead of into it. Serious as are the objections to the latter form of union, they are less serious than the objection to bestowing upon the Commonwealth a power of constraint, which when the crisis came, public opinion could not permit it to exercise.

The looser form of union would mean the abandonment, at least for the present, of British imperial sovereignty. The unity of the British Empire would rest upon persuasion or influence and, as Washington said, and Mr. Curtis likes to repeat, "influence is not government." But is not the distinguishing characteristic of the form of super-national organization needed by the British Empire an ultimate trust in persuasion rather than constraint for the settlement of internal disputes? It is not a League to Enforce Peace on possible malefactors; it is an attempt to organize an already existing practice of voluntary coöperation among certain free communities. The self-governing Dominions have sufficiently proved their loyalty to the Empire. They are entitled to escape subjection to an imperial government which would have the legal right to ignore their national interests and preferences. If the imperial government needed to exercise constraint upon citizens of any of the Dominions which the government of the Dominions was not willing itself to authorize, the super-national government would be likely to fail. Such a government, more than any other, must rest upon consent. What this means in practice is sufficiently clear. Instead of dividing, as Mr. Curtis proposes, the sphere of domestic from the sphere of foreign politics, and providing each with separate organs of administration, questions connected with foreign politics would have to remain associated with domestic politics and for the most part subordinate to them. Armies and navies and a plan of imperial taxation are primarily instruments of foreign policy, but they all have a profound reaction upon domestic, social and economic life. A nation such as Canada cannot afford to abandon the right to suit herself in accepting or rejecting conscription. On no other terms can she be master of her own household. She must be persuaded to acquiesce in an imperial policy either because it can be proved to be necessary, or because it has been modified to suit her reasonable objections. Unreasonable obduracy on her part or the exercise of constraint by the imperial authorities would both be fatal to the success of the greater commonwealth, of which Mr. Lionel Curtis is such an effective prophet.

H. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED